

THE
BRITISH REVIEW,
AND
LONDON CRITICAL JOURNAL.

“—FIAT JUSTITIA.—”

VOL. XVII.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR BALDWIN, CRADOCK, AND JOY,
PATERNOSTER-ROW;

AND
J. HATCHARD AND SON, PICCADILLY.

1821.

CONTENTS

61

No. XXXIII.

ART.	Page
I.—THE KING, THE QUEEN, AND THE COUNTRY.	
1. Henry the Eighth and George the Fourth, or the Case fairly stated, in Five Parts. By Thomas Harrall.	
2. Speeches of Mr. Brougham, Mr. Denman, and Dr. Lushington; containing the Defence of her Majesty, the Queen.	
3. Speeches of his Majesty's Attorney and Solicitor General, before the House of Lords, on Friday, October 24, 1820.	
4. Speech of the Right Honourable the Earl of Liverpool, on Nov. 3, 1820, and the following Day, on the Bill of Pains and Penalties.	
5. A Letter from the King to his People.	
6. Selections from the Queen's Answers to the various Addresses presented to her, together with her Majesty's extraordinary Letter to the King, and an Introduction and Observations illustrative of their Tendency.	
7. The Declaration of the People of England to their Sovereign Lord the King	1
II. The Comedies of Aristophanes. By T. Mitchell, AM.	50
III. The Life of Voltaire, with interesting Particulars respecting his Death; and Anecdotes and Characters of his Contemporaries. By Frank Hall Standish, Esq.	88
IV. Memoirs of the Rebellion, in 1745 and 1746. By the Chevalier de Johnstone, Aid-de-Camp to Lord George Murray, General of the Rebel Army, &c. Containing a Narrative of the Progress of the Rebellion, from its Commencement to the Battle of Culloden; the Characters of the principal Persons engaged in it, and Anecdotes respecting them; and various important Particulars relating to that Contest, hitherto either unknown or imperfectly understood. With an Account of the Sufferings and Privations experienced by the Author after the Battle of Culloden, before he effected his Escape to the Continent, &c. &c. Translated from a French MS. originally deposited in the Scots College at Paris, and now in the Hands of the Publishers.	106

CONTENTS.

ART.	Page
V.—THE UNITARIAN CONTROVERSY.	
1. Discourses on the principal Points of the Socinian Controversy. By Ralph Wardlaw, DD. Glasgow.	
2. A Vindication of Unitarianism, in Reply to Mr. Wardlaw's Discourses on the Socinian Controversy. By James Yates, MA. Glasgow.	
3. Unitarianism Incapable of Vindication: a Reply to the Rev. James Yates's Vindication of Unitarianism. By Ralph Wardlaw.	
4. The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity briefly Stated and De- fended: and the Church of England Vindicated from the Charge of Uncharitableness in retaining the Athanasian Creed. By Thomas Hartwell Horne, MA.	137
VI. Kenilworth; a Romance. By the Author of "Waverley," "Ivanhoe," &c.	216
VII.—BELZONI'S DISCOVERIES IN EGYPT AND NUBIA, &c.	
1. Narrative of the Operations and recent Discoveries within the Pyramids, Temples, Tombs, and Excavations in Egypt and Nubia; and of a Journey to the Coast of the Red Sea, in search of the Ancient Berenice; and another to the Oasis of Jupiter Ammon. By G. Belzoni.	
2. Plates, illustrative of the Researches and Operations of G. Belzoni, in Egypt and Nubia.	
3. Remarks on the Pyramid of Cephrenes, lately opened by Mr. Belzoni. By George Stanley Faber, BD.	230
LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS	263

ERRATA IN VOLUME XVI.

Page 404 line 33 for British Channel read Bristol Channel.	
410 line 22 for navigation read irrigation.	
412 line 17 for 120 read 150.	
413 line 35 for northward read southward.	
415 line 3 for nethermost read northernmost.	
416 line 6 from the bottom, the words <i>longitude</i> and <i>latitude</i> should be reversed.	
422 line 24 for Governor-General Macquarie read Governor, General Macquarie.	

CONTENTS

OF

No. XXXIV.

ART.	Page
VIII.—GREECE, ANCIENT AND MODERN.	
1. A Classical and Topographical Tour through Greece, in the Years 1801, 1805, and 1806. By Edward Dodwell, Esq. FRS.	
2. Travels to Sicily, Greece, and Albania. By the Rev. Thomas Smart Hughes	269
IX. A Vision of Judgement. By Robert Southey, Esq. LL.D. Poet Laureate, &c.	321
X.—ON METEOROLOGY, METEOROLOGICAL INSTRUMENTS, AND THE CLIMATE OF LONDON.	
1. The Climate of London, deduced from Meteorological Observations, made at different Places in the Neighbourhood of the Metropolis. By Luke Howard.	
2. Description of Instruments designed for extending and improving Meteorological Observations. By John Leslie, Esq. Professor of Natural Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh.	
3. Observations on the Climate of Penzance, and the District of the Land's-End in Cornwall. By John Forbes, MD. Secretary of the Royal Geological Society of Cornwall	357
XI. Memoirs from 1754 to 1758. By James Earl Waldegrave, K. G. one of His Majesty's Privy Council in the Reign of George II. and Governor to the Prince of Wales, afterwards George III.	362
XII. The Cenci, a Tragedy in Five Acts. By Percy Bysshe Shelley.	380
XIII.—SCRIPTURE CHRONOLOGY.	
1. The Chronology of our Saviour's Life; or, an Inquiry into the true time of the Birth, Baptism, and Crucifixion of Jesus Christ. By the Rev. C. Benson, MA.	
2. Watson Refuted: being an Answer to the Apology for the Bible, in a Series of Letters to the Bishop of Llandaff. By Samuel Francis, MD.	
3. New Researches of Ancient History. By C. F. Volney. Translated in Paris, under the Superintendence of the Author, by Colonel Corbet.	
4. The Books of Genesis and Daniel defended against Count Volney, Dr. Francis, &c. By John Overton	389

CONTENTS.

	Page
ART.	
XIV. The Outlaw of Taurus, a Poem: to which are added, Scenes from Sophocles. By Thomas Dale, of Bene't College, Cambridge - - - - -	422
XV. Tracts on the Divinity of Christ, and on the Repeal of the Statute against Blasphemy; to which is prefixed, a Preface containing Strictures on the Recent Publications of Mr. Belsham and Dr. Carpenter, with an Analysis of 1 John v, 20, &c. By the Bishop of St. David's - - - - -	434
XVI. Marino Faliero, Doge of Venice: An Historical Tragedy, in Five Acts. With Notes.—The Prophecy of Dante, a Poem. By Lord Byron. - - - - -	439
XVII. Memoirs of the Life of the Right Honourable William Pitt. By George Tomline, D.D. F.R.S. Lord Bishop of Winchester. - - - - -	452
LIST OF BOOKS - - - - -	503
INDEX - - - - -	509

THE
BRITISH REVIEW



AND
LONDON CRITICAL JOURNAL.

MARCH, 1821.

ART. I.—THE KING, THE QUEEN, AND THE
COUNTRY.

1. *Henry the Eighth and George the Fourth, or the Case fairly stated, in Five Parts.* By Thomas Harrall. Second Edition. C. and H. Baldwin. London, 1820.
2. *Speeches of Mr. Brougham, Mr. Denman, and Dr. Lushington, containing the Defence of her Majesty, the Queen.* Sherwood, and Co. London, 1820.
3. *Speeches of his Majesty's Attorney and Solicitor General, before the House of Lords, on Friday, October 27, 1820.* Maxwell. London.
4. *Speech of the Right Honourable the Earl of Liverpool, on Nov. 3, 1820, and the following Day, on the Bill of Pains and Penalties.* Maxwell. London.
5. *A Letter from the King to his People.* Seventh Edition. Turner. London, 1820.
6. *Selections from the Queen's Answers to the various Addresses presented to her, together with her Majesty's extraordinary Letter to the King, and an Introduction and Observations illustrative of their Tendency.* Hatchard. London, 1821.
7. *The Declaration of the People of England to their Sovereign Lord the King.* Hatchard. London, 1821.

IT seems to have been the general policy of other journals of any dignity or influence in the country, to leave untouched the painful topic to which the publications at the head of this article relate. It may be said, perhaps, even after we have broken the ground, that *still no Quarterly Review of any dignity or*

influence has intermeddled with it. One characteristic of dignity, however, we do most assuredly possess.—We have no body to fear or compliment—no man of any party of the state contributes to our pages,—no patronage circumscribes our freedom,—we are absolutely unobstructed by any interest, pledge, or obligation. But our readers need not be apprehensive that we are intending to drag them along that miry way, so lately trodden by the whole nation, and from which it has not been possible to come out undefiled. We shall not even enter upon the question of royal guilt or innocence; and although it may, peradventure, be pretty easy to infer from the tenour of our remarks to what opinion we incline on this distressing subject, yet it is our purpose to consider rather the conduct and designs of parties and individuals connected with it, and the general development it has produced of the moral, political, and religious state of the nation, than the merits or the proofs of the great case itself. With respect to the queen, there can be no doubt that it would have been greatly more for the interests of her reputation, to have lived down what she and her friends have designated as the persecution of confederated malice; to have assumed the demeanour which best corresponds with the character of calumniated innocence; to have consulted the dignity of truth and the self-respect of virtue, by keeping herself and her cause at an equal distance from the misguiding and misguided enemies of order and authority. In this has consisted the Queen's cardinal mistake. In an evil hour she has condescended to become an *instrument*, and to be prevented from seeing the real people. She has been hindered from seeing who are the depositaries of the mind and sense of the nation,—from seeing that the only strong things in the moral system are virtue and intelligence,—that the clamour which follows her through the streets is hostility in disguise,—that to rise as a queen, she must first be extricated and then exalted as a woman. She does not see, poor lady! and there is no one to tell her, that many among her most clamorous adherents were once the clamorous adherents of her royal husband also;—the very authors, promoters, and encouragers of that conduct, which now they exaggerate as the ground of their libellous abuse;—that were she to rise out of this contagious atmosphere a queen indeed, she would find the memories best stored with whatever tended to degrade her, and the hearts most disposed to fling all her conduct in her face, among those who now can see nothing in her case but persecuted innocence, nothing in the monarch but the similitude of a Nero, or a Henry the Eighth, nothing in the tribunals of justice, or the chambers of legislation, but plots against virtue, and the arts of confederated oppression.

The queen, with an utter ignorance of the real character of

the British people, ignorant too of the real amount of good sense in the country, which, but for the wilful blindness of faction is such, that there lives not in it the being so uninformed as not to see through and appreciate the views and motives of our present political agitators, has placed herself in the hands of persons, who, to serve their own purposes, have persuaded her to think that the best confutation of the charges against her would be to out-face them. Their own interests, as disturbers and destroyers, required that she should act upon this view of things: without anticipating the too natural inference, that to look with a face of adamant upon the world under the imputation of such delinquencies, could be possible only to one who was capable of committing them. What it may have cost her Majesty to suppress the feelings natural to her situation we cannot know, but we are quite sure that to seem to be above the shame of a suspicion so foul affecting one's character is to give countenance to the suspicion itself, upon the ordinary grounds and analogies according to which human character and conduct are estimated. There may be, indeed, a conspicuous integrity of life imparting a conscious security, and exalting innocence above the fear of reproach; but it does unfortunately happen that the nature of her Majesty's case is not such as to permit any inference to be drawn in her favour, from the aspect of boldness which she turns towards her accusers. An unbroken spirit under charges so heavy may be the bravery of innocence, or the bravado of guilt; and before legal examination, and the disclosure of attested facts, the fearlessness with which inquiry is challenged and met, affords, in varying degrees, according to circumstances, a moral argument of innocence; but after judicial investigation, this previous courage can add nothing to innocence proved, and may deepen the depravity of established guilt. It is, therefore, the worst policy imaginable industriously to assume this aspect of defiance before our trial, not only because there is always something in this pains-taking to appear innocent altogether different from those signs of inward satisfaction which belong to a self-acquitting conscience, but because, especially in a case where the crime imputed implies the want of shame, as soon as the tide of evidence turns against the accused, all the hardihood displayed before the trial runs, so to speak, in the very current of conviction. What this royal person has been accused of, does, in short, suppose the very effrontery with which the charges were encountered; the very principle of shame must have been extinguished before the acts imputed to her, with the attendant circumstances, could have been committed.

We cannot help thinking that the Queen has been her own great enemy in the course she has been persuaded to take, since

the accession of his present Majesty. A darkness has overspread her faculties in relation to her own permanent interest, from the moment she was taught to mistake for a personal feeling towards herself an unprincipled hostility towards Government—in some engendered by delusion and passion, and in others by the lust of power or plunder. It has been the great policy of the factious and seditious, to make her steps irretrievable, and as soon as possible to involve her in an irreconcilable quarrel with all the dignities and authorities of the land; to degrade her first among all persons capable, by their situation and opportunities, of weighing evidence and judging by the analogies of human conduct, and then to present her a persecuted and calumniated woman to that part of society which believe or disbelieve every thing as their prejudices or passions dispose them. The result has been, that the higher orders of society, and in general the soberer and sounder part of the nation, have seen and heard enough to induce them to stand aloof; and her Majesty's dependence is necessarily upon that flux body usually called the common people; who, unless she is enabled to support her credit, by a continued series of excitements, will let her drop into obscurity and neglect; happy to have escaped the fate of those idols which are wont to be destroyed by their worshippers for being worshipped in vain.

The Queen's case has not been without its political and moral compensations. It has disclosed the real condition of the country. By an operation not unlike the agency of chemical attraction, a new sorting has taken place among the various classes of society; deceptious combinations have been dissolved; and the kindred parts of the human character have presented themselves in their true affinities. It is to the community, as it is to the individual, a vast advantage to be brought acquainted with its actual and interior state; and it looks as if late events were at least fraught with one wholesome tendency—that of precipitating from its solution the whole mass of poisonous ingredients which have been long accumulating with a progress neither slow nor unobserved; but not sufficiently manifest to turn a slumbering and speculative fear into a vital and vigorous counteraction. Every secret mischief dispersed through the system has been obsequious to this new test; and, deserting their assumed bases, have run into a more natural union. A crisis has occurred, so auspicious to revolutionary and jacobinical hopes, that, for the purpose of a great and combined effort, every resource of hostility has been simultaneously employed; revealing at once the whole projected mischief in all the comprehensiveness of its methods. It is around the Queen's case that every art, and shift, and pretext—every libel, imposture, and distortion—

every hypocritical perversion, and every inflammatory scandal,—by which the constitution and government of these realms, ecclesiastical and civil, may possibly be brought into contempt,—have ranged themselves as ostensibly *her* agents, but in truth as the ministers of factious and revolutionary designs. Upon the whole, the Queen and her friends have done each other no good:—Her Majesty, if innocent, could derive no support from a connection with political demagogues; and the cause of these demagogues has suffered detriment by the full exposure of the whole machinery of their malice, with every wheel at work, and the whole mystery of iniquity developed to view. No person in the country supposes that the clamorous advocates for the Queen care more for her than they do for her chamberlain; and when the extreme cruelty and profligacy is considered of persuading her to brave the consequences of a trial,—the tendency of which was obviously to place her in the last situation in which a moral man could wish to behold his Queen, for the sake of covering with her name their own disorganizing views, and filling the land with calumnies against its sovereign and its government,—perhaps it may be fairly said that no queen was ever so abused, nor any community so mocked and insulted.

The times are teeming with instruction, and by this instruction our perils and alarms are in some measure compensated. How the nation will come out of its present difficulties, will entirely depend upon the amount of right feeling that exists in it: how its safety will in future be guaranteed, will depend, under Providence, upon the right direction which its moral energies and capacities may receive from the spirit of its government. There is only one broad and champaign way through which we can proceed on our march to a better and securer state of things. The evil is high up in the state, and resides in the very fountains of opinion; and the real reason why all our late and present efforts in the spread of education have been unavailing to fortify the common mind against the concerted malice now in operation against it, is simply and shortly this—that in our rage for reforming the moral state of the lower orders, we have too much neglected the immediate original sources of national improvement.

There is a first moving power in every political system; and it is quite absurd to look for correct action in the subordinate parts, unless the spring of motion is first attended to and rectified. In proposing such an altitude in the commencement of reform, the great question first to be determined is, who are the instructors of the people? To which we are prepared with what we deem an obvious and incontrovertible answer—the Clergy. In giving, therefore, a proper organization and direction to this

body, lies, in our opinion, the whole secret of reforming the minds and morals of the community. The great problem is to make the Clergy capable of their duty, and disposed to perform it. But so little is this attended to, that perhaps it would not be too much to assert that the ecclesiastical profession in this country is alone that for which there is no specific and strictly appropriate education. We speak only of the Clergy of the national Establishment; for, with respect to some of the dissenting communions, our impression is that the candidates for the ministry, whatever we may think of the ministry itself, receive a strictly preparative education, with a distinct reference to the duties they are destined to undertake; for which reason we find them in general, whatever may be their correctness or incorrectness in doctrinal matters, true to their trusts, and tenacious of consistency. There is no education that we know of for the Clergy of the established Church, calculated to lay a foundation of peculiar sanctity; to inculcate a higher sense of responsibility; or to train the habits to greater decorum and circumspection, than what the ordinary conditions of secular preferment, or good reception in society, impose. The Church is left to recruit itself from the mass—of educated persons, indeed, but of persons educated as well for one intellectual pursuit as another; and suffered to be engaged as deeply as other students in pleasures unsuited to the sacred profession. We have so often treated in this journal of the defects of moral and religious education, as it is carried on in our own country, that we shall not in this place dilate upon the topic; but we are quite satisfied in our minds that, unless something is speedily done, through the medium of our authorized teachers, to improve the tone of clerical piety, and supply the Church with more spiritual unction, however pompously we may legislate for making scholars and philosophers of the poor, we shall only descend with an accelerated speed through the gradations of infidel profligacy, till we reach that consummation which so many are now labouring, by the agency of an infernal press, and with a zeal which is rarely shown in a righteous cause, to accomplish.

The ear of Majesty can never be ours; we speak too plainly and independently for our Journal to penetrate the ranks that surround a prince; but if we could suggest to the gracious Monarch upon the throne what seemed to us most befitting his royal wisdom to do in the present moral exigency of the nation, we would say—redeem the patronage of the church, as far as it appertains to the crown, on every consideration, save the one only safe and adequate inducement—the honour of God. Make none bishops as a matter of political favour, interest, or reward; but only those who, though when startling at the greatness of the trust, they may

be hardly willing to be made bishops, will be willing, when become bishops, to be bishops indeed;—not to slumber on their couches of preferment, or to invent problems of divinity for ensnaring the consciences of candidates for ordination, but to enter upon a stage of constant and faithful exertion. Look among the watchmen and workmen, the men of toil and sweat, that labour on through good and evil report, stigmatized for their works of supererogation, and for being useful out of season, decided servants of the gospel living apart from secular affairs, in fervent charity with men and meek devotion to God;—from such materials carve out apostolical bishops; and on the same principle of preference and selection, let all church promotion, at its source and beginning, be governed and guided. Let its first salient spring be evangelically pure. Let an untainted hierarchy go forth from the crown to propagate the same principle of patronage through all their diocesan preferments, and by the flame of their bright examples to illustrate the path of spiritual duty, and expose the shame of clerical inaction in this hour of extremity and alarm. From this generous and politic procedure of the crown, all the lower classes of spiritual patronage will derive a lesson, and some, doubtless, will answer the call of their sovereign to imitate him in his vital care of a church, which is the mother of Christian subjection, of moral freedom, and of political stability.

We cannot but think that from such a beginning of the great work of moral reformation, a freshening impulse would be felt to carry the life-blood with a strong and reanimating current through the national system, and the British mind would erect itself against the insults upon its character and honour, which a venal and vitious press is hourly pouring forth. It might in the course of a few years be more hazardous to the safety of the mansion to cover its windows with libellous caricatures, alike false, profane, and filthy, than to maintain that most indisputable of the rights of an Englishman, the right of refusing to join the rabble in the expression of a feeling in which it shocks his sense of honour to seem to participate.

In the indulgence allowed to these emporiums of libels and caricatures, (the reader will pardon our rambling—it is the design of this article), it seems to have been forgotten that where their undisguised tendency is to bring the laws, privileges, magistracies, and public functionaries into contempt with the people, they have gone far beyond the limit which sane liberty, and a constitution that knows how to protect itself, can consistently allow. We are not disposed to go the whole length with Montesquieu in maintaining *honour* to be the solitary principle of monarchical governments in exclu-

sion of virtue ; and perhaps it may be the great excellence of the British constitution that it practically unites the characteristic principles of the republican and monarchical forms, and has thus solved the most difficult problem in human affairs :—mercy forbid ! that what the above-mentioned acute but system-loving writer affirms of monarchies in general, “ that the state dispenses with the virtue which is directed to the public good, honour being a substitute for it,” should be in any measure true of the state under which we live ; but we will adopt his reasoning to the extent of maintaining that honour, especially the honour of our great men, is a necessary ingredient in our constitution. The very execution of the law in its high judicial departments supposes the paramount obligation of the principle of honour ; it is this principle which casts a generous glow over the intercourse of private life, gives lustre to rank, and sparkles on the brow of majesty ; it is courtesy to the gentleman, dignity to the nobleman, security to the merchant, and chivalry to the soldier ; it is the virginity of the soul that shrinks from the appearance of contamination with a natural horror, and out-runs the decrees of virtue by the vehemence of its spontaneous instincts ; it is that “ unbought grace of life,” that heroism of sentiment, over which the genius of Britain hangs with nursing delight ; it is that which completes, in the fulness of its proportions, the moral stature of an English gentleman. But whatever of this principle is allied to station or function, all that respect for rank which teaches rank to respect itself, every wholesome prejudice which, by encircling nobility with an ideal glory, raises the standard of its real worth ; all which the sanction of the law, or the spirit of the constitution, annexes to the aristocracy as one of the integral parts of the civil and social system, are now alas ! turned into mockery, and made the game of low and envious libellers. It is observable, that when the best men of Athens became the sport of the stage, and were ridiculed upon their gems and medals, the morals and spirit of the people fell rapidly into decline, until they sunk under the tyranny of Macedon. If the *virtue* of republics, which is their very essence, according to Montesquieu, has been undermined by malicious ridicule and profligate buffoonery, what is to become of the *honour* by which, according to the same writer, monarchies are characterised and sustained, if all that is honourable in name and place is daily handed over to the scorn and malice of the mob by the traffickers in abuse and the panders of a prostitute press.

But the venom of the libellous agents of revolution is principally directed against the crown. Those who conspire against the constitution make this the great mark of their destroying system. To the steadiness of the crown we owe

the signal success in which our long contest with jacobinical tyranny has terminated, and the maintenance, under God, of our protestant liberties. Our kings of the Hanoverian line have been almost the only true whigs in the nation. To their constancy and consistency is to be ascribed the fact that since the accession of that house, the constitution has experienced neither change nor vacillation. Of the perpetuity of our political blessings, the crown is the pledge and guarantee; in the monarch, as the first magistrate, the law concentrates the government of the realm, and therefore invests his person with a political sanctity. All which are so many motives with "that species of men, who are nourished into a dangerous magnitude by the heat of intestine disturbances, and to whom a state of order would become a sentence of obscurity" to do what they can to bring down majesty from its sacred elevation;—every step of which procedure is so much in advance towards the subversion of the state.

When a man of sense thinks it of importance to write a book, like that at the head of our present article, to prove that George the Fourth is not fitly compared with Henry the Eighth, we may judge to what a length of depravity the treasonable heart in this our day has proceeded in the treatment of a gracious and constitutional King. What then is this King, upon whom the press is pouring forth all its poison, and satire all its ridicule, contending which shall render him most odious in the eyes of subjects bound to him as much by the ties of gratitude as of allegiance? His virtual reign as Regent of this realm has been at least as glorious and felicitous as any in our annals. Not a single abuse of prerogative—not one harsh act of government can be charged upon him—the letter of the law has never been extended against the substance of liberty—and nothing has been done in defiance of the habits and feelings of the virtuous and the free. No charter has been invaded—no hope of the state has been disappointed—no pledge has been unredeemed—no call of philanthropy disregarded; his sceptre is green with the buds of national instruction, and moistened with the dews of public charity; the worship of God has had its area multiplied; the most forlorn of the population have been advanced to a state of intellectual culture; every trust for the benefit of the poor has been brought within the scope of special inquiry; literature and science have alike elevated the commercial and military character; equity and fidelity have marked our foreign transactions; our victories have been the triumphs of humanity; after the waste and consumption of a twenty years' war, the revenues of a principality have in Britain been contributed and applied singly to the diffusion of the Scriptures; and amidst actual war, and its succeeding difficulties, her Christian influence has kept pace with

her geographical discoveries. This continues to be the state of things under George the Fourth.

Yet the personal character of this Sovereign has been more traduced and vilified than that of any other monarch or man. If the chivalrous homage with which the loyal and the brave were wont to encircle the throne, is no longer the characteristic of Britons, the ordinary sentiments of a British subject, and the common candour of a gentleman, are offended and outraged by the base and atrocious manner in which his Majesty's person and government have of late been attacked by contumelies and indignities from which the least in the country are privileged and protected. Every English gentleman puts his pen to paper, or his hand upon his sword, when his private peace and honour are invaded by a slanderer; he can challenge proof, he can repel falsehood, he can confront his accusers—but the King's majesty is the but at which every base fellow can shoot his arrows with impunity; and there is nothing which reprobate malice can assert that malevolent credulity will not believe and propagate. There is not a person of the commonest propriety of thinking, that can pass one of the numerous print or pamphlet shops in our streets without saying to himself—these things should never be in a land where the claims of justice are acknowledged, or the rights of man respected.

How then stands the character of the Monarch on the British throne? Is it to be measured on the scale of those selfish unquiet men, who prosecute an endless quarrel with rank and property, and all the fair and harmonious proportions of society; spirits that have no lot or part in the order and economy of life,—that “go to and fro in the earth, and walk up and down in it” to desecrate, demoralize, and, if possible, destroy it. Or shall we take his character from those who constitute what is called the Whig Opposition to his government;—from men that under the pretext of a constitutional jealousy, adopt for their selfish ends the vilest instruments; coalesce with principles the most profligate; and with a double treachery bribe the passions of the turbulent, that they may ride upon their backs to power, and then leave them to wallow again in the mire. Their royal master will never again take his character from these false friends. He was once in their mouths the most amiable prince in the world; and we do not forget that one who well interpreted their wishes to the nation was prosecuted for expressing, in terms that seemed libellous towards the reigning Monarch, an impatience for the happy hour when the Prince of Wales should ascend the throne, of which he was in all respects so worthy. The father then was assailed through the son, and the popularity of the Prince was grounded on his opposition to the

King. Was he then more estimable than he is now? Was he when all men, the Whigs especially, contended who should express his eulogy in the highest terms, a better man, than since he has filled the throne of his father, and trod in those steps, and adopted those maxims by which we stand at present, sharers indeed in the necessary results of a war of unprecedented length and expense, but in all that forms the real greatness of empire, the capital of the moral and intellectual world. The remnant of the Whig Opposition, whether old or new, have no vote in this matter: they are estopped. If, with an ill conscience they quote the father against the son, they quote him against themselves; they record their own conviction; they are stunned by the recoil of transactions too well remembered. Neither the Monarch upon the throne, nor the memory of the departed King, is within the jurisdiction of their praise or censure.

If we estimate the characters of our princes by a comparison with those potentates whom history records as best loved in their day, and dearest to the memory of after ages, those blemished patterns of excellence will plead for some allowance in behalf of men less free than others to follow their genuine affections, and greatly more obnoxious to the force of temptation.

Tried by the holy rule which inspired authority has given us, neither in kings nor subjects are the passions an excuse for sin: but let those who deem themselves privileged to censure the conduct of their Sovereign, ask their hearts how stands their own secret reckoning with their Maker upon the same account; or how long, if their actions, like those of a prince, were exposed to observation, would their characters endure the scrutiny of man. We put this more particularly to the consciences of those men of rank and fortune, perhaps of dissipation, who affect to be offended with what, upon grounds little examined, they charge upon their Sovereign, because he is their Sovereign, or because he governs without them or their friends.

Men of practical observation, who wish to be right upon the merits of parties, and the great points of political controversy, without a lengthened inquiry into particulars, or the fatigue of comparing arguments, may in these days decide for themselves pretty safely by regarding the operation of the principle of mutual attraction by which the different classes of public characters coalesce. We will not say that persons of a particular humour in politics, at which our readers may guess, are knaves, or any thing like it, but this we *may* say, because the obvious fact will bear us out, that somehow or other, when we know a man to be a knave we may be quite sure to what politics he is attached, and when a man has cast off religion, he need not inform us respecting his sentiments on public affairs.

The political edifice in this country depends, under God, upon the moral basis upon which it stands; we are now in the predicament of being thrown entirely upon the right constitution of the public mind for support. Our condition is very peculiar: history records nothing precisely similar in the state of any political society: for when and where has it occurred that upon the floor of a great and powerful nation the vital point has been openly contested, whether an economy built upon Divine sanctions were to have countenance, or to give way to a godless system of speculations, engendered solely by the selfish passions of our degenerate nature? The contest is critical and severe: but it is consolatory to reflect, that virtue has some inherent advantages over vice; that it has, by a blessed and paramount arrangement, a settled tendency to accumulate power in society, and to prevail over any sort of power which is not under its direction. In the same manner as reason has a tendency to triumph over brutal force, and to give to man an ascendancy over the rest of the animal creation, so has virtue, by its celestial prerogatives, a tendency to acquire superiority, and a progressive enlargement of its power. It exerts this tendency by rendering public good an object and end to the members of a society; by inspiring diligence, recollection, and self-government; and by uniting men together in the bonds of mutual affection and confidence. We cannot doubt that in this country there is a sufficient proportion of virtuous men to give virtue its proper ascendancy if circumstances will permit; for much less force under the direction of virtue will prevail over a much greater, numerically and physically calculated, not under its direction. In this short and busy scene, virtue has not its proper latitude of operation; its doom is, therefore, to be for ever militant until it enters the triumphal portals of heaven to enjoy its allotment of seraphic joy and peace. But here it is the great business and policy of good men to improve its opportunities and advantages, and to obtain for it a sufficient area,—a stage on which it may have room and freedom to act its appropriate part.

That men who have nothing to hope from the dominancy of virtue, to which their condition and hopes bear an inverse proportion, should endeavour to deprive it of its natural advantages, and contract as much as possible its field of operation, is no matter of surprize; but it is a case of difficult solution when men of birth and fortune, for the sake of their minor game of politics, their objects of selfish competition, and the interests of their petulant quarrels, in which they fume and fret without even the sincerity of anger, or the substance of feeling, are found rash enough to unite with men in real earnest and of superior mettle in the work of demolition; to whose dire success they

• can indeed largely contribute, but in which it is not for them to partake;—a success which will soon give a sanguinary repose to their squabbles for places, and as the earliest friends of revolutionary enterprise make their property glitter among the earliest trophies of its relentless triumph. No folly has ever exceeded the folly of those men of wealth and rank, who in this perilous crisis of human affairs, while the inundation is spreading towards their parks and lawns, when every motive of moral prudence puts them naturally upon the defensive, are still bent upon gratifying their puerile malice against ministers by throwing fresh supplies into the threatening element, weak indeed as to their quality, being still but water, but adding destructively to the mass, and the momentum. Are their capacities too short to take the gauge of this ponderous and progressive accumulation, as a scale to determine the strength of that embankment which civil institutions, only strong with opinion to support them, have raised around their envied possessions? Is the folly of faction never to be cured but by its final and fatal success? Will it never open its eyes but to see its own consummation? Must its repentance always be the business of its last hours, when the lesson comes too late for amendment?

We have placed at the head of this article the several publications which have come accidentally into our hands, touching the great question which has taken into its vortex all the various political principles and projects of the day, with a view rather to justify ourselves in a general view of the state of the country, than with any design of giving our opinion on the question itself. We find it impossible, however, to forbear commenting upon some of the speeches with which we have headed our paper. Those delivered by the counsel for the Queen more particularly challenge our observations. Whatever may be their merit, regarded as displays of eloquence, we cannot but think them, if they are correctly reported in the above publications, as in many essential respects defective. To complain of their unsoundness would be scarcely fair towards them, the situation of the speakers considered: but we may be allowed to observe, that they have not what essentially belongs to the success, and is therefore a necessary part in the constitution, of eloquence—the appearance of sincerity. Mr. Brougham has committed the greatest fault that an orator can commit; he has renounced that altitude, he has come down from that elevation of which he should have been peculiarly zealous—the appearance of speaking, not as a counsel under the paramount obligation of his retainer, but as a man impressed with the justice of his case, the servant of his conscience, and the willing defender of truth. If Mr. Brougham's opinion be right, a barrister is privileged

or enslaved by his profession,—privileged above all the duties of his general relation to society in behalf of his client,—enslaved by being liable to be dragged at his chariot wheel through ways impassable to men of ingenuous and virtuous minds.

“ He had before stated to their lordships—but surely of that it was scarcely necessary to remind them—that an advocate, in the discharge of his duty, knows but one person in all the world, and that person is his client. To save that client by all means and expedients, and at all hazards and costs to other persons, and, among them, to himself, is his first and only duty; and in performing this duty he must not regard the alarm, the torments, the destruction which he may bring upon others. Separating the duty of a patriot from that of an advocate, he must go on reckless of consequences, though it should be his unhappy fate to involve his country in confusion.” (*Speech of Mr. Brougham, p. 4.*)

So horrific a proposition we cannot but think Mr. Brougham will not in his cooler moments be disposed for a moment to maintain. In maintaining it, however, on the occasion alluded to, he was guilty of a worse than gratuitous sacrifice of the oldest maxims of social virtue; for the sacrifice did his client harm. What could be the natural effect of such a declaration and avowal, but to rob all his efforts of the charm of sincerity, and to make his speech smell throughout offensively of the retainer. We will not affect to draw the line that bounds a barrister's privileges or obligations in respect to his undertaking or conducting causes, but we will venture to say in general terms that his duty to his profession or his client can never require him to act in direct opposition to his moral conviction, to the plain interests of society at large, and, least of all, so as to endanger his eternal welfare.

We cannot but strongly hold that a barrister is professionally bound to a large contribution of aid towards the success of those tendencies of collective virtue above alluded to as the true security of all free states, and preeminently of our own—the freest of the free.

Barristers would be more than men if they were not acted upon by the temptations to assume the franchise, to which Mr. Brougham has seemed to consider them as entitled, and we think it clear to every observer of the bar, that a certain indifference to the essential qualities of actions is not unfrequently the result of the marketable exposure of their talents. We would not therefore carry this evil, for evil it is, beyond the necessity of the case. It is surely much more safe and useful to remind men under this sort of temptation of their imprescriptible obligations to maintain the great landmarks of general justice, and moral rectitude.

The concluding part of Mr. Brougham's speech is equally open to the double objection of being in principle wrong, and in policy injudicious. If the assembly which he was addressing were really liable, taken as a body, to be influenced by personal fear, the grounds of intimidation were obvious, and the cause of the Queen would have had the same advantage from them without the mention of them by the advocate. To mention them therefore was gratuitous, and, as far as it was likely to operate at all, was likely to create a counter effort to avoid the imputation; but it was moreover highly indecorous, not to say dangerous, to appeal to a motive which ought to be the last to influence honourable minds in the dispensation of distributive justice. The speech in general cannot but be highly thought of as an oratorical performance: to us it appears to be defective in address, and in the talent of persuasion, while it abounds in a species of invective that produces revolt and reaction in the hearer, and falls very short of that tone of sentiment and pathos of expression which, if they do not impart the dignity of truth, imply at least sincerity of feeling.

"Such, my lords (Mr. Brougham continued), is the case now before you, and such is the evidence by which it is attempted to be upheld. It is evidence—inadequate, to prove any proposition; impotent, to deprive the lowest subject of any civil right; ridiculous, to establish the least offence; scandalous, to support a charge of the highest nature; monstrous, to ruin the honour of the Queen of England. What shall I say of it, then, as evidence to support a judicial act of legislature, an *ex-post facto* law? My lords, I call upon you to pause. You stand on the brink of a precipice. If your judgment shall go out against your Queen, it will be the only act that ever went out without effecting its purpose; it will return to you upon your own heads. Save the country—save yourselves. Rescue the country; save the people, of whom you are the ornaments; but, severed from whom, you can no more live than the blossom that is severed from the root and tree on which it grows. Save the country, therefore, that you may continue to adorn it—save the crown, which is threatened with irreparable injury—save the aristocracy, which is surrounded with danger—save the altar, which is no longer safe when its kindred throne is shaken. You see that when the church and the throne would allow of no church solemnity on behalf of the Queen, the heart-felt prayers of the people rose to Heaven for her protection. I pray Heaven for her; and I here pour forth my fervent supplications at the throne of mercy that mercies may descend on the people of this country richer than their rulers have deserved, and that your hearts may be turned to justice." (*Speech of Mr. Brougham*, p. 57, 58.)

Of the speech of the second counsel for the Queen, which is also referred to at the head of this article, we cannot speak in terms of praise. It is hostile, and heavy,—vituperative without

being vehement—unjust without plausibility. The comparisons of the case of George the Fourth and the present Queen with that of Henry the Eighth and Ann Boleyn, and that of the Emperor Nero and Octavia, stand upon no other foundation of resemblance than the mere fact of the separation between man and wife: the grounds of the separation, and the conduct of the parties, are so strikingly dissimilar, that the comparisons were only fit for the display of contrast. Comparisons, indeed, are grossly unjust upon such an occasion: it is a sort of case that can receive no illustration but from a candid inquiry into all and only its own peculiar circumstances. We are determined, however, not to be led into this question, and shall content ourselves with observing upon Mr. Denman's allusions to Henry the Eighth and Nero, that those wicked and detestable men will only continue to be without parallels in this country, as long as a just sense of liberty, and a manly feeling of attachment to the principles of the constitution as settled in 1688, shall prevail to keep under that malignant spirit, the offspring of continental atheism, which compels into its service every distress and every casualty, as they arise, and arise they will in every political system, for the purpose of throwing into confusion the arrangements for human happiness—that paradise which its devilish nature is tormented by beholding. The Greek quotation we cannot but think was in very bad taste, to say no worse of it; we will not disturb it by any further remark. The conclusion of this speech is the only part of it which shall draw from us any additional comment. Within a little space it encloses many ridiculous errors. The simile drawn from fighting and conquering is surcharged, and spiritless,—the effervescence of puerile commonplace. If the triumph of his learned friend was complete, no random arrows ought to have been shot; it was a superfluous and a dangerous chivalry that might do harm by wounding an ally in the tumult of conflict; and indeed the last random arrow upon this occasion might well have rested quietly in its quiver. The Lords are called upon to imitate the *justice* displayed in a case where *mercy* and not justice was displayed; and to imitate in a case of asserted innocence a behaviour applicable only to a case of undissembled guilt, not to mention the concession involved in the recommendation. It is doubted by a contradictory scepticism whether *Omniscience itself possesses the power of arriving at the secrets of the female in question*. The sacred allusions which occur in this part of the speech are offensive to propriety—we will not in this place assume any thing of a higher principle. “The down-sitting, and up-rising” words so beautiful in the place from which they are borrowed, and borrowed much at random, appear to us most unsuitably arranged with the

context into which they are forced; and we will say only of the phrases, "I know nothing in the whole race of human affairs, nothing in the whole view of eternity" that they must be erroneously printed.

"Before I conclude, I must be permitted to say, that during the whole of this proceeding (though personally I have every reason to thank the House for its kindness and indulgence) the highest gratification resulting to my mind has been, that with my learned friend I have been joined upon this great occasion. We have fought the battles of morality, Christianity, and civilized society throughout the world; and, in the language of the dying warrior I may say,

'In this glorious and well-foughten field
We kept together in our chivalry.'

While he was achieving the immortal victory, the illustrious triumph, and protecting innocence and truth, by the adamant shield of his prodigious eloquence, it has been my lot to discharge only a few random arrows at the defeated champions of this disgraceful cause. The House will believe me when I say, that I witnessed the display of his surprising faculties with no other feelings, than a sincere gratification that the triumph was complete; and admiration and delight, that the victory of the Queen was accomplished. This is an inquiry, my Lords, unprecedented in the history of the world: the down-sitting and uprising of this illustrious lady have been sedulously and anxiously watched: she uttered no word that had not to pass through this severe ordeal. Her daily looks have been remarked, and scarcely even her thoughts escaped the unparalleled and disgraceful assiduity of her malignant enemies. It is an inquisition, also, of a most solemn kind. I know nothing in the whole race of human affairs, nothing in the whole view of eternity, which can even remotely resemble it; but the great day when the secrets of all hearts shall be disclosed!

'He who the sword of Heaven will bear
Should be as holy as severe!'

and if your Lordships have been furnished with powers, which I might almost say scarcely Omniscience itself possesses, to arrive at the secrets of this female, you will think that it is your duty to imitate the justice, beneficence, and wisdom of that benignant Being, who, not in a case like this where innocence is manifest, but when guilt was detected, and vice revealed, said—"If no accuser can come forward to condemn thee, neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more." (*Speech of Mr. Denman*, p. 89, 90.)

As our object has all along been not to discuss the question of the Queen's guilt or innocence, but to consider the characteristic features of the times connected with it, we shall of course not enter into any detail with respect to the matters stated or commented upon in the published speeches of the Attorney or Solicitor-General, which we have also taken as the subjects of this article. For perspicuous and well-digested narrative, for lucid

exposition and judicious comment; the speeches of the Attorney-General upon this memorable occasion are, in our opinion, very worthy to be studied and imitated by the profession in general. They are perfectly free from the rhetorical exaggeration, puerile ambition, false ornament, and affected bluster of the bar; and they are sustained precisely at the proper elevation for the dignity of the speaker and the exigence of the occasion; so that it seems to us to be quite impossible for any candid person with his mind at liberty upon the subject, not to feel the stress of truth and sincerity powerfully affecting him from the very style and character of the composition, independently of its arguments and deductions.

The conclusion of the Attorney-General's reply appears to us to be peculiarly able. He sharpens his steel at the forge of the Philistines, and makes them furnish the means of their own discomfiture. The passages in the speeches for the defence, which we have alluded to in terms of censure, on account of their want of principle or propriety, are very skilfully and effectually turned against the speakers in the following peroration:

“ I congratulate your lordships that I now approach the end of my task. It has been my duty, my anxious duty, to call your Lordships' attention to the evidence given at your bar. In this duty I have endeavoured rigidly to confine myself. I hope your Lordships will acquit me of having unnecessarily appealed to your passions or your feelings. Such has not been my object. I have endeavoured merely to perform the only duty imposed upon me by your Lordships, that of laying the evidence before you, and to comment as fairly as I could on its bearings. This has been my sole object, as this was my only duty. But, my Lords, it should seem, from what we have lately heard, that another duty may be imposed upon an advocate. My learned friend has told you that, regardless only of his client, an advocate may proceed, regardless of all the world beside, and reckless of the consequences, even though it should be his lot to produce confusion in the country for a season. Such was the text of my learned friend. Your Lordships have heard the speeches founded on it. To me it appears that the duty imposed on my learned friends was to protect and vindicate her Majesty, and refute, if they could, the charges brought against her. In the performance of their task they have considered it to be open to them to cast invectives on all around. Even the King himself was not to be spared; and, modern history exhausted, my learned friends go back to the annals of corrupt Rome, to search for the means of wounding the feelings of royalty; and the Monarch of this country has been insulted by being compared with the most cruel and most blood-thirsty despot of antiquity. Nay, not alone has the Monarch been insulted; even your Lordships have not been spared. Perhaps some excuse may be found for my learned friends, when it is considered how desperate is that cause which it is their duty to support. My Lords, if the Queen were innocent, these

invectives, these topics would be irrelevant. Her innocence cannot be established by hurling these envenomed darts around. No, my Lords, innocence, secure in its own purity, stands on a firm base, and requires not the aid of arts like these; it seeks not to inflame; it demands justice, but pants not for revenge. It will be time enough, when innocence is established, to pursue those who have aspersed it. At present, I cannot think that the course taken by my learned friends, is that which it was their duty to prefer. But in his peroration, Mr. Brougham has told your Lordships in the conclusion of his eloquent speech, that the public has pronounced the Queen innocent. My Lords, the public has pronounced no verdict. A part of the public I grant there is, who have pronounced a verdict. There are those who, by the basest, and most insidious means, have attempted to mislead the loyal, the honest, and the good part of the community, by industriously blackening the conduct of all concerned in carrying on these proceedings. They, while the cause of the Queen is in their mouths, have other objects in their hearts, and seek but to stimulate the people to rebellion and revolution. It is painful to reflect, that those who have such objects in view should have met with any encouragement. They will receive no countenance from your Lordships. It is only on the evidence produced before you that your Lordships will found your decision. But you have been told, my lords, in the peroration of my friend, Mr. Brougham, to pause before you decide; that you stand on a precipice, and that if you give your judgment against the Queen, it will be the last judgment that you will ever pronounce. Nay, you are called upon, as the only means of preserving the honour of the crown and the purity of the altar, at all hazards, and at all risks, whatever the evidence may be, to give a verdict of acquittal, because, forsooth, such, in the opinion of my learned friends, such is the decision to which you ought to come. You, my Lords, are not thus to be worked upon; you are not to be influenced by such attempts at intimidation. I know that I am now addressing persons of high honour, and of unstained reputation, whose decisions have hitherto been revered, because they have been founded in justice. You will sustain your exalted character, you will best protect the honour of the throne, and the purity of the altar, by coming to a just decision on the evidence before you. On that evidence I rest my case; and if it lead you, as I think it inevitably must, to give a verdict of guilty, you, I am sure, will not want courage to pronounce it; and doing so, my Lords, you will best satisfy your own consciences, and sooner or later, the country." (*Speech of the Attorney General*, p. 105, 106.—114.)

The preposterous absurdity, to characterize it by no harsher terms, of the parallel drawn between the conduct of Nero towards the innocent Octavia and that of our Sovereign towards the Queen, is successfully combatted by the Solicitor-General, whose speech, also, at the head of our paper, taking up the subject in its state of exhaustion, is judiciously occupied with the

illustration of particular topics, and the task of repelling the in-
 jectives of his opponents.

"In the early stages of this inquiry," (says this able lawyer and reasoner) "appeals were made to the reign of Henry VIII. and the cruelties exercised by that monarch. Those appeals were considered then as sufficient to satisfy the purposes of the use; they were deemed sufficiently powerful in having to answer the object of this defence. But what have become of the appeals to the case of Lady Anne Boleyn, and the barbarities of Henry VIII.? They have ceased to have any impression for the purposes of her Majesty's defence; a higher flight is necessary in the next stage of this inquiry. To my surprise—to my amazement and utter astonishment, my learned friend, Mr. Denman, whom I have long known—whose character and private life I have long loved, has for this purpose dared to say that no page in the history of the ancient or modern world furnishes a parallel to the abuses and cruelties her Royal Highness has experienced, unless it is in the annals of Rome in its worst period—in the history of its worst and most infamous sovereigns! My Lords, the Princess of Wales is said, in her sufferings, to stand in the same situation as the Empress Octavia! How are we to answer this, but to see in what situation Octavia did stand, in order to see the enormous nature of the charge referred against the Government of this country. Octavia's father was murdered by Nero—Octavia's brother was murdered by Nero, in the presence of Octavia. She, one of the most pure and spotless beings the world ever produced—she was charged with having a criminal intercourse with a slave! My Lords, there was not the smallest semblance of truth in the charge; she never advanced this charge; she had never promoted him to orders; she had never slept in the same room with that slave, but without evidence she was sent into banishment. She was seen in Gaul when this took place. The most infamous of men—the most atrocious of monsters was employed by Nero, to murder his own mother Agrippa, and I believe that this Nero, to get rid of his wife Octavia, told her "you must confess that you have had an adulterous intercourse with your slave, and you shall undergo nominal punishment, but you shall be pardoned." Reluctantly the confession was made; the confession was taken for proof, she was seized—her veins opened—the blood did not flow sufficiently quick—she was drowned in hot water, and her head was sent to Nero, to glut his cruelty. My Lords, that is the conduct of Nero and his myrmidon. They were acting together in this foul and infamous transaction. What are we to say then when counsel like my learned friend, entertaining the best possible feelings on all other occasions, feels himself justified, in a court of justice, in saying that the case of Octavia bears a resemblance to the case before your Lordships; nay, not only bears a resemblance, but that it is the only case that can be presented in ancient and modern times, that can be put in any competition with such a transaction! I confess, when I heard

this, my blood was paralyzed with horror. I hardly understood where I was, or from whom it was this extraordinary language proceeded. But, my Lords, what is still more extraordinary, my learned friend has not the credit of novelty in this comparison. No, it is not his own; for I find in a newspaper, which I hold in my hand, an advertisement published some time before the speech of my learned friend, couched in the terms;—"Nero vindicated!" published by whom? By a name well known, an individual of whom I know nothing, but from those publications which are ushered into the world, "Printed for William Hone, Ludgate Hill." Now, my learned friend condescends to make himself the instrument to such a person as I have described; to prefer such charges in this high and august assembly against the monarch of his country! My Lords, what will my learned friend say, if I imitate the same course in answering his argument? What will your Lordships say—what will my learned friend say, if I quote the language of Tacitus, of whom he is so fond—"Isontibus innoxia consilia; flagitiis manifestis, subsidium ab audacia petendum."—I should not have dared to make such a quotation, only that I find it in the same page with the passages which my learned friends have quoted." (*Speech of the Solicitor General*, p. 155, 156.)

We will add, also, the concluding part of the same speech, for the sake of its just and vigorous comment upon the improper and impolitic appeal of the Queen's Counsel to the personal motives of fear, and the threatened consequences of a conviction of the party accused:

"My learned friends have endeavoured to awaken every sympathy, every passion of your Lordships' nature; they have even appealed to the basest of all passions, the passion of fear. In the high and august assembly of a nation renowned for its firmness and intrepidity my learned friends have appealed to the passion of fear. Your Lordships have been told by one of my learned friends, that if you passed this Bill into a law, you would commit an act of suicide. By another of my learned friends you were told, that if you passed this Bill it would be at your—peril! The words hung sufficiently long upon my learned friend's lips to be clearly understood, but they were afterwards affectedly withdrawn. I was astonished to hear such arguments urged—arguments which could not serve, but might have an injurious effect on the case of the illustrious individual in whose behalf they were urged. I know, my Lords, that your Lordships dare not do any thing unjust; but I know at the same time that you will do what the ends of justice require, without regard to any personal consequences which may follow. But, my Lords, it is not in this place only that such arts have been resorted to; a similar course has been followed out of doors—every attempt has been made to intimidate your Lordships and overawe your proceedings. Even the name of her Majesty herself has been profaned for base and factious purposes. In her Majesty's name, but undoubtedly without her consent, attacks have been made upon all that is sacred and venerable. The Empire—the Con-

stitution—the Sovereign—the Hierarchy—every order of the State—all has been darkly and malignantly attacked under the shield of her Majesty's name. But, my Lords, I do not suppose that this has been done with her Majesty's consent, if it had, well might we exclaim—

‘dum capitolio
Regina dementes ruinas
Funus et imperio parabat.’

In such a case we might well expect the commencement of a new era; but I again say, that I impute no such motives to her Majesty. I say, my Lords, that if, in looking to the whole of the evidence, you shall have the strongest moral conviction on your Lordships' minds of her Majesty's guilt, but yet feel that there has not been such evidence brought forward as would lay the legal foundation of guilt; in that case, my Lords, you will throw out this bill; you will say to her Majesty, in the language of my learned friend Mr. Denman, ‘go thou, and sin no more.’ But, my Lords, if, on the other hand, looking with that calmness and impartiality which the great importance of this case requires, you find that the case is borne out by the strongest, fullest, and most satisfactory evidence, if no doubt hangs upon the minds of your Lordships, then, my Lords, knowing the Tribunal I have been addressing, I am sure you will pronounce your decision on this great and momentous question with a firmness consonant to your high and exalted station.” (*Speech of the Solicitor General*, p. 167—168.)

We have also placed the speech of the Earl of Liverpool on the second reading of the Bill of Pains and Penalties at the head of our article, not for the purpose of any particular examination of its contents, but simply to call the attention of our readers to it, as an instructive sample of the gravity and simplicity by which truth should come recommended from the mouth of a nobleman of this great and free community. Really, when one reads the virulent charges brought against the state, of which this elevated, respectable, and amiable person is one of the principal administrators and organs, and without whose large participation no confederate guilt of unprincipled misgovernment can possibly be incurred—when one reflects upon the coarse and ferocious obloquies with which his public character, as well as that of his associates in the invidious station of ministers, is loaded, bearing in our minds how confuted by all experience is the distinction between public and private principle—when one sees the vulgar demagogue, with neither principle nor peace in his bosom, leaving his occupation, his duty, and his unhappy home to hurl the thunders of his execration at the head of this honourable man, whose elegant and moral life is the ornament of the public sphere in which he moves, and the joy of his domestic retirement; one discerns by a short glance of the mind the vast difference in disposition, in temper, in habits, in the

elements and capacities of social happiness, between those that maintain and those that menace our ancient and tried institutions, between those that cherish the spirit of improvement combined with the principle of conservation, and those that speculate upon the chances of violent change, or general confusion. The speech of the Earl of Liverpool is one that will be long remembered, for a distinction which is not to be attained by the rhetorician's art,—the impress of candour and feeling on every sentence. It is a speech also on which the slavish fear calculated upon by some of the speakers on this question, has evidently had no operation. There is a tempered courage, and intrepid moderation spread over the whole, which, in these days, are absolutely necessary to carry the value of virtue beyond the individual that possesses it into the social atmosphere by which he is surrounded. We will exhibit to our readers the latter pages of this plain and manly oration :

“ A bill of pains and penalties, my Lords, is a bad name : but let me entreat you, fairly and candidly, to consider what the nature of this bill is. Is this bill, in its effect, regard being had to the relative situation of the parties, any more than an ordinary divorce bill, such as you have so frequently before you ? I do not mean that the parties have greater advantages. In any case where the wife of any of your Lordships, or of your Lordships' ancestors, has been divorced, is she not actually degraded—is she not deprived of her rights, prerogatives, and privileges ? And is she not degraded upon the same principle, and exactly almost in the same terms, as those which are contained in this bill ? I know, my Lords, that on occasions of that kind you have decisions of the Ecclesiastical Court, but not always ; for many divorce bills pass without any such decision being before the House. I admit the rule generally ; but I deny that it is a principle upon which *all* divorce bills *must* proceed. We have been told too, that in other cases, the accused has a full right to *recriminate* ; but then the individual is in a far different situation from the Queen. Here the exclusion of that rule cannot operate as a hardship upon the Queen. A Queen of this country does not come forward like a private individual. She stands before the public and the country, claiming prerogatives and privileges which must be founded upon her own individual innocence and purity, unmixed with the doctrines out of doors ; unaided by popular declamation. I say then, my lords, that when it is endeavoured to stigmatize this bill as a bill of pains and penalties, it is no more in its operation, than one of those bills which you are constantly in the habit of passing. They are bills which often operate harshly, because, perhaps, they injure those who have not been the aggressors :—because, perhaps, those individuals have not the power of retaliating ; because, perhaps, they are feeble and unprotected, and are not upheld and supported by popular feeling, manœuvring their innocence in the face of manifest guilt. The Queen has none of these hardships to complain of. She has advocates most able, she has means most ample,

and she derives every assistance, even from her accusers, to establish her innocence, if it can be established. My Lords, it has next been said, that this measure is inexpedient and unnecessary, and the noble Lord opposite has personally addressed me, and told me that, because I brought this bill into the house, it would be highly improper for me to vote on this important occasion. Before I address myself to that, however, I beg leave to offer an observation as to what has been said with respect to the inconvenience that will result, if this bill do pass. I would ask the noble Lords who intend to vote the second reading of this bill to look on the other hand, and see the tremendous inconveniencies that would arise from rejecting it, after this question has been brought to the bar—after it has been investigated,—and after the parties have joined issue upon it. If, my Lords, you believe her Majesty guilty, and yet reject the bill, it will be a complete acquittal, moral as well as legal, and it will be a triumph of guilt under circumstances the most fatal. Reflect, my Lords, upon all the different bearings of this case; and recollect that in such an event, the Queen would not retire from this bar like an humble individual acquitted for want of evidence. No, my Lords, she is Queen of this country, and she will take that title and its prerogatives, tainted with crime, should you not vote for the second reading of the bill, though you think her guilty of the charge imputed to her. Do not your Lordships recollect a most respectable individual, in a decent and respectable situation of life, being found guilty of the crime of adultery?—and do you not recollect the disgrace and degradation which attached to him for the manner in which the crime was perpetrated? I will not prejudice your opinions; I will not attempt to warp your judgments; but never let it be said, that while you believe her guilty, you dare not pronounce your conscientious opinion. I believe in my conscience, whatever opinion may prevail as to the consequences, I firmly believe, let the consequences be what they may, that is the safest and wisest course; and I rely on the good sense of the country, that those consequences will neither be fatal nor prejudicial, when they see your opinions have been declared according to the best of your judgment, and according to the dictates of your conscience. The noble Lord opposite has alluded to the clamour out-of-doors; and he says most truly, that attempts will be made by the seditious and disaffected to take advantage of your decision, if you should pass this bill, and turn it to serve their own evil designs. My Lords, that is most true. In times like these, undoubtedly there are always too many evil spirits abroad, anxious to seize on any public grievance to serve their own base purposes, and to fan the flame of faction, without caring, for a single moment, about the guilt or innocence of the Queen. And would to God, my Lords, I could say, that the Queen had kept herself clear from all participation in such attempts.—Look, my Lords, to the answers she gives those addresses which are daily presented to her. Can we look at them, and say we think they are the answers of a person who, conscious of her innocence, patiently waits the decision of that tribunal before which her conduct is arraigned? Would not the true line to be adopted be, that which she pursued most properly in the answer

she gave to the first address that was presented to her? There she declared that, conscious of her innocence, she was ready to meet her accusers, but she did not wish her case to mix with public politics. I do not say this, my Lords, to prejudice your minds for a single instant against the illustrious individual whose case is now before the House. But, my Lords, if you believe her guilty, and yet reject the bill, as I said before, it will be the triumph of guilt over truth and justice. Let me beseech you, then, to suffer no threat or fear to deter you from doing that duty which you are bound here to perform, according to the dictates of your consciences. With respect to the personal appeal which the noble Earl opposite has made to me, I desire to say, that I have looked into the conduct of other persons who have been in my situation upon bills and measures of a similar nature, and I do not find that it was on those occasions thought consistent with public duty, or consistent with the rights of a peer, upon a public measure to abstain from giving their opinions or votes. This doctrine applied to impeachment at the bar of this House, and I think it applies to the present case. I remember when the father of a noble friend who sits near me was some years ago impeached at the bar of this House; the King's Attorney and Solicitor-General conducted the prosecution; the ministers brought it forward; and yet the noble Lords who then held office in the government did not in any degree think themselves precluded from voting. I say that in substance the present case is the same. I say, that upon so important a question, and on so great and public a measure, I will not preclude myself from expressing my opinion, nor will I divest myself of my right as a peer to assert my opinion, and to support it by my vote. I will rely on my own honour, feelings, and integrity, to guide me to that which is right; and I will rely on the public to do me justice in believing that I act conscientiously and honestly. To conclude, we have, my Lords, now to discharge most undoubtedly a high and important duty. We come now to a decision, in which, I hope and trust, your votes will not be influenced by fear, affection, or interest: and I trust and believe, every peer will give his vote from the bottom of his heart, according to the best of his judgment, and in fulfilment of the dictates of his conscience. I will not believe—I never can believe—that the country will not do justice to your decision. I have the highest confidence in the country that they will reverence your decision, and I am sure the country reposes its fullest confidence in the integrity of this tribunal. You are, however, my Lords, a tribunal that, like all other tribunals, stands before the greater tribunal of public opinion, and by your acts you will be judged. But if you give an honest vote upon this subject, whatever it may be, the public will do you justice, and will feel that vote has been given according to the best of your judgment, and in strict obedience to the dictates of your conscience. Allusions have been made by the noble Lord opposite, to the judges of the land. I know not to what he refers: but without adverting to that circumstance, I will say it gives me the highest satisfaction that this trial proceeds in the presence of the judges of the land. It gives me also great satisfaction that after this trial is closed, we debate the question in the presence of those judges. I am

sure they have been to us of the greatest assistance in determining points of law; and I think it highly proper that we have their aid. Heaven grant your decision may be such as will satisfy the ends of justice and vindicate the cause of truth!—Heaven grant it may be such as will bear the test of judgment here and hereafter; that in pronouncing your decision you may safely appeal for the truth of your judgment to that Being to whom alone the secrets of all hearts are open. And when, at the last day, we shall render an account at the tribunal of Eternal Justice, we may feel warranted in our conduct here, and know we have administered justice in mercy, without pronouncing a harsher judgment, or a severer punishment, than is absolutely necessary, doing right between the Queen, the public, and our God." (*Earl of Liverpool's Speech*, p. 26—30.)

The publication entitled "Selections from the Queen's Answers to various Addresses presented to her," which is one of the list at the top of our article, is a compilation of great singularity and curiosity. There is no doubt that many of the answers here recorded contain aphorisms of unquestionable certainty and importance on the side of constitutional freedom; the point is, are they connected with the Queen's cause? And is the violation of them, or of any of them in regard to the Queen's person, a gratuitous and baseless assumption, or a fair ostensible deduction from facts? Into this question, on the margin of which we have all along been treading, we must still refuse to embark; but as demonstrations of a spirit of profound intrigue and contrivance to extract from every event what revolutionary virtue it may contain, we think we may, consistently with our plan in this article, bestow on them a little attention. That they are not the lucubrations of her Majesty is beyond all controversy clear; it would be silly to ask whether they contain her sentiments: they have been fabricated, like any other manufactured article, to answer a special purpose; and her interest in them goes no further than to their suitableness to her immediate occasion. Of the composition she probably neither knows nor cares any thing. One can only wonder at her unreserved abandonment of her cause to persons who have far other interests than her own to serve; who have divorced that cause for ever from the great and indispensable maxims of public safety, and suspended it upon the ominous success of revolutionary projects. Of the orbit of a King's consort the throne can be the only proper centre. Shooting out of this sphere it is impossible for her to find her element elsewhere, or to rush into harmony with any other system, especially in regions beyond the walk of human discovery, amidst the vortices and eccentricities of democratic speculation.

Of the shame and scandal of these answers to addresses, the Queen is only a negative participant, by permitting them to go forth in her name. The probability is, that few of them have

been offered to her perusal; and we wish to think that only the two or three first were seen and approved by her as the models of those which were to succeed. The three first contain the following sentiments.

“The Common Council of London, 16th June.

“If any thing could lessen the grief which I must still feel for the loss of those dear relations, of whom I have been deprived since I left England, it would be the proofs I now receive upon my return that their memories are cherished as their virtues deserved. In the new trials to which I am exposed, my first duty is to vindicate myself, and my next wish is to see nothing attempted that may hurt the feelings of others.

“But in all the troubles through which I have passed, the generous attachment of the English people has been my safe-guard against the King’s enemies and my own; and be well assured that no time can ever weaken the grateful impressions of such obligations.”

“Nottingham, 30th June.

“Sincerely as I must ever deplore the distresses that may fall on any of my fellow-subjects, I must decline to speculate upon their probable causes, or to cast reproaches upon their supposed authors. *Having come to this country for my own vindication, I cannot mix political animosities with my just cause.*

“My fervent prayers will be constantly offered up to the throne of mercy for the happiness and prosperity of the whole English people; and there is no portion of them for whom I feel a livelier interest than the inhabitants of Nottingham.”

“Preston, 3d July.

“The object of my coming here has been the vindication of my honour; and I shall perform the sacred duty which I owe alike to the country and to myself, without making myself a party to the political divisions which exist.”

Now, if these were really the first feelings of the Queen’s mind on her return to this country, and the sentiments expressed in the answers to subsequent addresses were also really her own, we can only lament that, in the sequel, she should have so apostatized from her early professions, or fallen under the influence of such bad counsels. But if, with an understanding that all succeeding answers to succeeding addresses were to breathe the same innoxious spirit and the same prudence of political reserve, she cast the whole business of framing these answers upon others, without personal knowledge of their contents, we can only exclaim, that there lives not a more insulted being,—a more pitiable victim of treachery,—than the Queen of England.

Had every answer been of the same character as the three which we have produced, and her conduct been consistent with those answers,—resolute without defiance, retiring without timidity, displaying the firm aspect of integrity, and rejecting

adventitious support from passion, delusion, or depraved ambition, the hearts of the good and the brave, the moral and religious of the land would have been touched with a generous sympathy for their unhappy Queen;—her failings and miscarriages would have been half forgotten, half discredited, and all forgiven by the nation. But, unhappily, the very reverse of all this has been the course adopted. The Queen's case was soon perceived by the ill-disposed part of the country to be rich in capabilities; they saw in it the means of insulting their Sovereign, annoying the government, aspersing the nobility, and throwing ridicule and contempt upon the clergy. It is not necessary to confirm this observation by examples—they are in every body's recollection. Every reader of the newspapers will remember that tissue of inflammatory appeals to the populace, of which the answer to the address of the operative classes of London may be taken as a pretty good specimen, where we have the following memorable passage,

“There have been times, and perhaps those times may still be, when the hard-earned bread of the long toiling peasant or mechanic is insufficient for his numerous family; when the penury has been succeeded by the inquietude of the night, and when night and day, day and night have been only a sad succession of pining wretchedness, and of hopeless woe. That order of things, which in a large portion of the community necessitates the acquisition of subsistence by the sweat of the brow, is the institution of Providence for the benefit of man; but who does not see that it is not owing to the wisdom of the Deity, but to the hard-heartedness of the oppressor, when the sweat of the brow during the day is followed by the tear of affliction at its close; when the labour of the hand only adds to the aching of the heart; and what ought to be a source of joy is an aggravation of calamity. But if these things have been, I may perhaps be permitted to hope that they will, ere long, be only as the troubled scenery of a dream; and that happier times are approaching, when commerce will crowd our rivers, trade be busy in our streets, and industry smiling in our fields.”

The above bombastical, hypocritical, and dangerous cant, may be taken as a fair average sample of the style and tone of these compositions dispersed over the country in a time of unusual difficulties in the agricultural and trading classes, the unavoidable consequences of a long war in itself unavoidable,—from which it may be seen how fully by this time the full value of the Queen's case was understood, as affording a principle as active as the power of steam to set in motion the machinery of the passions, and to transmit and distribute its impulse into whatever may be the direction given it by the diversified agency and multiplied occasions of mischief. After all, perhaps, the real reason of the difference observable be-

tween the three first and the succeeding answers to addresses, may be found in the difference between those legal advisers to whom the Queen submitted her earliest acts after her return to these shores, and those more decided men who have conducted her across that rubicon, beyond which all restraints of queenly policy, or feminine reserve were to give place to higher thoughts, and a bolder career of enterprize.

The Letter to the King, which is introduced at the end of this pamphlet, and which may be regarded as the great state paper or proclamation of the party to whom her Majesty has committed her cause, is now, we believe, considered as a document of great indiscretion by even that party itself. By this letter, the eyes of all were opened to the scope and purpose to which her case was to be expanded; and more wrong was done the Queen by this than by any other transaction which has been covered by her name. There is assuredly decorum of sentiment enough in the British mind rightly to appreciate the character of an interference calculated to inflame animosities between man and wife, aggravated by the circumstance of that man and wife, being the King and Queen of the country. If ever there was a hope of exterior reconciliation, or of a treaty that might cicatrize a wound in which every bosom of feeling participates, this was the method of all that could have been devised the best adapted to disappoint that hope, and to perpetuate the nation's sorrow. "This was the most unkindest cut of all;" for it cut asunder the last silver thread by which charity, when all peculiar ties are gone, still holds us together in the intercourse of general benevolence. There is scarcely any composition in the language of which a humane or Christian person would feel himself less capable of being the author, than of this unjust and opprobrious epistle.

We will not enter into any particular consideration of the letter in question. It has been sufficiently examined and weighed by the reflecting part of the nation. One passage alone compels us, by its peculiar malignity and dishonesty, to throw away a remark upon it. The letter alludes to a passage in the letter of the King, written in April, 1796, in which his Majesty, then Prince of Wales, thus expressed himself:—"Our inclinations are not in our power, nor should either of us be held amenable to the other; because Nature has not made us suitable to each other. Tranquil and comfortable society is, however, in our power," &c. By the above passage, it is most obviously clear that nothing more was meant than that the Prince found it impossible to bestow his affection on the Princess, his inclinations not being within his controul,—not surely that his inclinations had migrated to any other object, which would, indeed, have been but a licentious excuse for his dissatisfaction with his

wife: but this is the construction indecently and insidiously put upon the passage by the letter written in the Queen's name. "The separation," says this letter, "so far from being sought by me, was a sentence pronounced upon me, without any cause assigned, *other than that of your own inclinations*; which, as your Majesty was pleased to allege, were not under your controul." And, again, "The 'tranquil and comfortable society' tendered to me by your Majesty, formed in my mind but a poor compensation for the grief occasioned by considering the wound given to public morals in the fatal example produced by your Majesty's inclinations."

A more shameful perversion of another's meaning and expression, for the sake of an assault upon his quiet and his character, is not easy to be found. Nor can it escape notice, that this imports to be an answer to a letter written and answered above four and twenty years before. This is quite enough to fix upon this letter from the Queen its appropriate character, and to make it every good man's bosom-prayer, that, since the issue of the late trial before the Peers has been considered by the Queen and her advisers as calling on her Majesty's part for a solemn thanksgiving, she may be made sensible of the deep importance of "studying to be quiet," and of making what is thus deemed the triumph of innocence an æra of repose to the King and to the nation from those troubles and inquietudes to which it is impossible that innocence can lend itself, and from which it is equally impossible that the Queen in any event can derive either honour or security. No convulsions of the country could shake out any benefit to the consort of the King. Their differences might be "reconciled in ruin;" but by no change or chance of revolutionary occurrence can these differences ever be decided, the situation of her Majesty improved, truth more satisfactorily developed, opinion rectified, or controversy composed.

The Liturgy question has been decided, and not a small part of the nation will think that in that decision the whole case of the Queen has been virtually comprehended. Though we shall not trouble our readers with our opinions at any length, on a subject so little to our taste, yet it would not consist with the character of our journal to let any momentous question, touching religion, lie in our path without attracting our regard. "That the order of council, for erasing the name of the Queen from the Liturgy appears to this House to have been ill-advised and inexpedient," was a motion in spirit and import miserably below the tone of the petitions to the House, and the general expectation excited by the challenges of her Majesty's champions. In proportion as it was calculated to give to the Queen the advantage of every shade and modification of opinion, it widened the basis of the argument afforded by its

failure. For our own parts we cannot understand how any of the arguments used to demonstrate the illegality of the rejection of the Queen's name can be regarded as applicable to the motion; for if the rejection was illegal, it seems strange in the extreme to our minds to bring into question its expediency;—what is in strictness illegal, may be supposed expedient, and what is legal, may very evidently be inexpedient; but we do not hear so often as to be reconciled to it, of an *inexpedient* breach of the law of the land. A man might as well complain that a soap manufactory had been set up in his neighbourhood, which was a great nuisance, and besides that not very agreeable. That the King, as head of the Church and head of his family, has the power of settling the form in which the members of his royal house shall be noticed in the public prayers of the church, we have never felt the possibility of doubting. Insertions, changes, omissions, and erasures, by the Sovereign's authority, are frequent enough before the act of uniformity, to show how the point was then considered, and since that act they have been of such common occurrence, as to show that that statute was never held to take away the power before possessed, and often exercised by the King. The principle of law requires, that for this effect there must be express words; which are so far from being found in that act, that the clauses bearing upon the point are declaratory and confirmatory of this natural and necessary branch of the kingly authority.

Whether the rejection of the Queen's name from the prayers of the church, leaving her to be included in the general description of the royal family, with that silent supplication of the heart which the Christian in spirit will be apt to frame for her Majesty's peculiar circumstances, was expedient or otherwise, we shall not consider more at large, than we have the legality of the measure; but we will, for we cannot help it, observe that such a question can never be properly discussed but by those who know something of "the spirit of prayer and supplication," of "the Spirit that maketh intercession," and of "the prayer of faith." Those christians who think that the services of God, to be of any worth, must be spiritual, intellectual, holy, the incense of the heart's sacrifice, the fruit of Christian sorrow, hope, and thanksgiving, the earnest of an union with the Creator, and Redeemer, will not deem it a light matter to make our Liturgy the medium of official homage, or state formality, beyond the length to which it has already gone. We could well spare, though no one will suspect us of disloyalty, or of wanting homage for the Crown, all laudatory epithets, or what appear to be such, though perhaps susceptible of another interpretation, bestowed upon the King's Majesty in the prayers of our church; and we believe that if we prayed for him simply as our Sovereign Lord the King, an

objection to our Liturgy, with which some good men feel strongly impressed, would be removed, and equal honour would be indicated to the Sovereign.* To bring the Queen's name into the service as a special object of prayer, with the usual epithet of *gracious*,† an epithet unquestionably importing, at the time it was introduced, the communication or reception of Divine grace, according as it was applied to God or man, would at least, to say nothing more of it, be to increase that courtly formality which, in the minds of many, lower the sanctity, by lessening the sincerity, of our forms. Nothing should be made ostensibly the object of our prayers for which we cannot pray heartily; and heartily, we presume, every good man can pray for the family of the King, after praying for the Sovereign himself as God's special servant and instrument; for they are the patterns to which the manners of the country form and adjust themselves,—they surround the throne like a luminous zodiac, or involve it in the darkness of an eclipse; but if, instead of a general prayer for the royal family, the name of one is distinguished as the special and cherished object of our supplications at the throne of grace, unless such peculiar interest in the person so selected is honestly felt, so to pray is little else than to flatter human greatness, and to mock the majesty of heaven. Such a habit of praying leads to that criminal lukewarmness so frequently condemned in Scripture; and beautifully compared by Taylor to the phantastic fires of the night, where there is light and no heat, and which therefore may pass on to the real fires of hell, where there is heat and no light.

When the *legality* of his Majesty's interference with the Liturgy is the question, men with hard hearts and unholy bosoms may be qualified for the discussion; but, if the legality is conceded, and the expediency or propriety be the subject of consideration, it seems to us that politicians, and lawyers, the violent, the venal, the verbose, the men of "vain imaginations, vain affectations, vain altercations," should stand aloof, nor "touch the ark—of this magnificent and awful cause." He alone is adequate to the topic, whose lips have felt something of the touch of the live coal from the altar. It is a question which that mind alone is upon a level with, that feels all the worth of that for which prayer must ask, if it asks aright,—the purchase of the Saviour's blood, the effect of his intercession, the fruit of his sacrifice, the gift of his healing, the efficacy of his grace,—things greater than diadems, and all else that life can possess, and therefore not to be solicited for ourselves or others but with an earnestness

* We dare not hope that his Majesty will ever see this paper, but if he should he may cast perhaps, a reflecting eye upon this suggestion.

† In the services of religion, and in the works of our old divines, as in the sermons of Jeremy Taylor throughout, this word is used as above stated.

equal to the prize. Such and such only will feel all the reverence due to our holy and comprehensive Liturgy. He will see it, indeed, in connection with the state; but not as an engine of state-policy. He will see in it a constitution agreeable to the earliest and purest standard; at once spiritually independent of the state, and practically maintaining with it a genuine alliance. He will see how it tempers freedom with obedience, and how beautifully in exchange for protection it casts over the civil institutions its warm investiture. He will deem it an unkind forgetfulness of this condition of mutual benefit, should the state, by its authority, make the services of our holy Church subservient to political arrangements, or arbitrarily inflict upon it the language of insincerity.

We cannot help yet further insisting upon the necessity of a certain frame and disposition of the heart to qualify for the question, whether any subject of supplication shall or shall not be introduced into the liturgy of our church. It is not for the "disputers of this world," for forensic wranglers, or trading politicians, or mere party-men, still less for the hierophants of sedition, and least of all for the encouragers of parodies upon the church service, to settle upon its true grounds a controversy of this kind. Our Liturgy throughout is full of spirituality and purity, and its stated as well as occasional services are all calculated to raise the mind to a holy and heavenly fervour: none can approach it duly and rightly but in a state of deep personal humiliation, or proceed in it to any good purpose without a sincere desire for an increase of grace to hear meekly HIS word, to receive it with pure affection, and to bring forth the fruits of the Spirit. Those who thus come to the sanctuary, and who thus feel and think of its services, and those only, are the persons we are at all disposed to attend to, on this delicate question; the thing itself must first be sacred in our eyes before we can be fit judges of what ought to make a part of it. And with this observation we will dismiss the subject.

The pamphlet entitled, *An Address from the King to his People*, puts a language in some places into the mouth of the King, of which we do not altogether approve. It is defective in dignity. The habitual homage due to majesty demands that the King should never express himself to his subjects in the style of justification or apology, and still less, of familiarity, with respect to his domestic affairs. The King cannot with propriety or safety enter with his people into the details of his own conduct. And therefore a pamphlet assuming such a form ought to have proceeded with a proper regard to these considerations. We have also some doubt of the policy and utility of giving to a publication of this sort the semblance of having proceeded immediately from

the King. It would certainly have been what the loyal subjects of his Majesty would have disapproved of, had he really written the address imputed to him; and for this reason we cannot but think that it was incorrect, to say the least of it, to put forth a semblance of what would have been wrong if real, and which probably has left the impression of a fact rather than of a fiction on the minds of many. But after these deductions on the score of propriety, it is due to this performance to say of it, that it contains as many well expressed and important truths on the subject, which has of late divided and agitated the nation, as any of the ephemeral publications to which that subject has given birth. We could select many interesting and well reasoned passages from it respecting the grounds of the unhappy separation of their Majesties, and of the consecutive treatment of the Queen; but we forbear to do so, from an apprehension that, as all these points have been so long and vehemently controverted, it would be hardly consistent with impartial justice to present one side of the case, without entering into the discussion of the opposite arguments and statements, whatever may be our own personal conviction. Besides which we are mindful of our resolution to avoid plunging into the vortex of the agitating and distressing question of the Queen's general guilt or innocence. Our readers will remember that, at the outset of this protracted paper, we announced our intention of confining ourselves to the considerations suggested by the ungenerous use which has been made by faction of this most afflicting case, and the attempts grounded upon it to bring the King's majesty and all the high constitutional authorities of the kingdom into contempt and odium by the most unwarrantable and shameless libels, calumnies, and caricatures, by which private peace and honour, or the solemn rights of public morality and opinion, have ever since the world began been invaded and violated. The extract which we now present from this pamphlet to our readers, appears to us to put many things well, fairly, and moderately.

"I proceed now to the offer of an ample allowance to the Queen, provided she continued to remain abroad in the retirement she had voluntarily adopted; and the alternative with which that offer was accompanied. I have pointed out *this transaction*, and the *suspension in the Liturgy*, as acts which may appear to have emanated more immediately from my own personal feelings.

"I have previously remarked, that from the period of my becoming Regent, the differences between the Princess and myself had assumed a political character, and been treated by many as a party question.

"The companions of my youth, and the distinguished characters with whom, in my earlier years, I had intimately associated, had created in the public mind a widely extended, and readily believed opinion, that when the sceptre of my father should descend to me, I

should, from among those associates, have chosen the members of my administration. During the discussion of the terms of the regency, I was careful to avoid giving any pledge of the line of policy I might find it expedient to adopt. A short previous administration, composed of those political friends by whom it was conjectured my councils would have been directed, had enabled me to form some opinion of their executive talents; and *notwithstanding*, an overture was made by me to them, to propose an administration. But when I found the conditions required would have reduced me to a mere political automaton, of which they were to possess the key; that, not content with forming the administration, they required also, that I should be surrounded in my household by their adherents, and left to no choice in the appointment of my own attendants; when with this, I compared the candour and the unequivocal absence of all personal feeling with which the bill creating the regency was carried by the then ministry; and above all, the frank, loyal, and respectful regret which was shewn to the calamity of my revered parent; and the so immediate provision made for the resumption by him of the regal dignity, that should it have pleased Providence so to have restored him; my royal father would have awakened, as if from a dream, and have found himself unreminded of his affliction; when to this I added the important consideration, that the flame of freedom was beginning to glimmer in Spain: that the then administration were prepared to take advantage of every circumstance favourable to the destruction of the military tyrant of Europe; and when all these various considerations were upheld by the weight of personal character which was contained in the then cabinet; I felt sufficiently justified in not suffering former prepossessions to stand for one moment in the way of newly created duties. I felt that an existing experienced executive was, at such a time, safer than a theoretical cabinet. I had also a doubt in my own mind, whether, during my Sovereign's life, I ought, as Regent, to adopt the principles of those who had been violently opposed to my royal father's measures, or pursue a line of policy unchanged, and such as my King would have continued had he remained the active head of the Empire. This was a feeling of the heart; it was mine.

"This, my determination, produced two consequences; 1. A series of unbroken, glorious, and important victories, attended with such results, as the history of the world, within a similar period of time, cannot produce; 2. The conversion of my matrimonial differences into a political attack upon my authority.

"From this moment then, the Queen, by becoming the tool of party, gave to her cause and her conduct a new feature, and an importance which required the vigilant eye of the government.

"I have been led into this digression, that the distinction I still endeavoured to uphold between my marital and royal station, might be plainly and easily comprehended. I return now to the consideration of the offer made to the Queen, of an allowance upon certain stipulations; viz. that the Queen should *cease to use* the name and style of Queen of England, and remain abroad, where she had voluntarily seceded.

"The period when this determination was decided upon must not be forgotten; it must not only, not be forgotten, but it should be allowed its due weight in the decision of so momentous an affair. It appears almost indeed to be overlooked, that I met my first parliament in the month of April, at the very period and while a set of infuriated, misguided, and unhappy culprits were on their trials for a conspiracy to overturn the constitution and government of these realms, of which the commencement was intended to be, the indiscriminate assassination of my cabinet ministers. The general situation of the country, at that precise moment, appears also to have been thrown into the back ground. I cannot better recall those unhappy inauspicious moments, than by repeating again to my subjects the topics addressed to the Lords and Commons in Parliament assembled, upon our first meeting.

"My Lords and Gentlemen,

"Deeply as I regret that the machinations and designs of the disaffected should have led, in some parts of the country, to acts of open violence and insurrection, I cannot but express my satisfaction at the promptitude with which those attempts have been suppressed by the vigilance and activity of the magistrates; and by the zealous co-operation of all those of my subjects whose exertions have been called forth to support the authority of the laws.

"The wisdom and firmness manifested by the late parliament, and the due execution of the laws, have greatly contributed to restore confidence throughout the kingdom; and to discountenance those principles of sedition and irreligion, which had been disseminated with such malignant perseverance, and had poisoned the minds of the unwary and ignorant.

"I rely upon the continued support of parliament, in my determination to maintain, by all the means entrusted to my hands, the public safety and tranquillity.

"Deplored, as we all must, the distress which still unhappily prevails among many of the labouring classes of the community, and anxiously looking forward to its removal or mitigation, it is, in the mean time, our common duty, effectually to protect the loyal, the peaceable, and the industrious, against those practices of turbulence and intimidation, by which the period of relief can only be deferred, and by which the pressure of the distress has been incalculably aggravated.

"I trust that an awakened sense of the dangers which they have incurred, and of the acts which have been employed to seduce them, will bring back by far the greater part of those who have been unhappily led astray, and will revive in them that spirit of loyalty, that due submission to the laws, and that attachment to the constitution, which subsist unabated in the hearts of the great body of the people, and which, under the blessing of Divine Providence, have secured to the British nation the enjoyment of a larger share of practical freedom, as well as of prosperity and happiness, than have fallen to the lot of any nation in the world."

"If to the pending trials alluded to, and this general reference to the state of the kingdom, suffering under severe privations in some of

its provinces, are added the numerous cases of treason, libel, and minor political offences under the progressive cognizance of the courts of law; I think my subjects and countrymen will admit, that to such previously existing evils *no addition was wanting to renew internal agitation which was beginning to subside.* The return of the Queen, under the circumstances in which she must necessarily meet, was, of all others, calculated to revive that internal agitation; and why was it so calculated? because the Queen had (as I have previously remarked) given by her conduct a political feeling to the differences between us. Had this not been the case, she could not have had, at least she ought not to have had, any motives for her return; or had she any, she ought to have sacrificed them to the welfare of our country.

"From 1796 we had been separated, a period now of twenty-four years; disturbed by an almost constant suspicion of her conduct: the Queen had been estranged from court, our royal daughter was no more; and her Majesty had but one duty to perform towards me, 'the performance of an agreed separation.'

"A Queen consort of England has no political rank, she possesses, *in case* of the Sovereign, certain inherent prerogatives; those prerogatives are capable of being enjoyed by her, in her absence; they required not her presence. The presence of the Queen could neither revive trade languishing in some of its branches, tranquillize the irritation of distress, or conciliate the clamour of faction; and indeed, many records of English history hand down to us the impolitic and dangerous counsels, which have ensued from the interference of Queens Consort in the political contests of the times." (*Letter from the King*, p. 25—30.)

"The declaration of the People of England to their Sovereign Lord the King" is the only other pamphlet engendered by the state of the times, which it has fallen in our way to notice. The object of this production is to excite the people of England to zeal and unanimity in defence of their King, their laws, and their genuine liberties, against what it considers an unprincipled faction in the country, composed of persons calling themselves Whigs, and those who are stigmatized by the name of Radicals. By way of specimen of its style and matter we extract the following passage.

"16. It is not, however, this ignorant multitude alone we have to contend with. We observe with astonishment, that not only the ruder and democratical part of our population; not only those who, from their desperation of character, owe nothing to decency and decorum; nothing to the regards of good men; nothing to the fears and feelings of society; but the very aristocracy of the realm, the very members of your Majesty's Parliament, though few we trust in number, yet sufficiently appalling in influence, are accessories in the shaking, we had almost said in the subversion, of your Majesty's throne. In no other light can we view those stated appeals to the headstrong passions of

the people; those defamations, increasing in virulence and vulgarity, which certain of the Whig members of the House of Commons, seconded by their allies in the Upper House, are daily pouring forth. More like mountebank stagers than members of a British parliament, we see them leaving their native representations, and migrating from place to place to play the demagogue, and to root up the authorities of the land, wherever they can spread the strife between our Sovereign Lord the King and their Sovereign Lord the people.

"17. A conduct like this, we know not whether to treat with more abhorrence than disgust. For the services of such patriots, flattered as they may be by the minions of their own faction, neither your Majesty nor the people of England can feel much predilection. They can only hope to be called to the helm when revolution has left the field at their own disposal. Addressing disaffected assemblies, and applauded by disaffected assemblies, they are becoming, like their radical coadjutors, deaf to the voice of reason and hardened against the reproaches of conscience. In a few months more, the assimilation will be complete—"bone of their bone, and flesh of their flesh." With every cause to be satisfied, this wretched part of our aristocracy are eternally discontented. With every inducement to be grateful, they are cold-hearted and frozen. With every call upon them, if they value life or property, to look at home and rally round their Sovereign, they desert the government, the altar, and the throne!" (*Declaration of the People of England*, p. 15—17.)

This is what may be called putting the case strongly, perhaps somewhat too gloomily. We are not, we trust, on the margin of a revolution, though it may with truth be said, that the history of the country presents no parallel to the present crisis: no case in which efforts have been so combined and systematized for the palpable purpose of vilifying all legitimate authorities, and finally dissipating all the elements of a free and constitutional government. It is going rather far to say, that the two classes of malecontents above named have alike in view these sacrilegious ends. The Whigs of the present day are not the Whigs which Lord Somers would have acknowledged; but their ultimate purpose is clearly not that general destruction in which they themselves would of necessity be comprehended; a consequence to which they cannot be blind: but what simplicity is so great as not to see that the difference between these classes lies less in the principles by which they are actuated, than in the circumstances in which they stand. They severally pursue their own designs, which by the one are only to be accomplished by a promiscuous overthrow; while the consummation of the others' hope, stop, we presume, at the acquisition of the power which is wished only because not possessed. Either party seems disposed to join the other, and to shelter their projects under the same pretext. Reform is the ragged ensign with which they both proceed

to the battle, each having in reserve an appropriate banner, that waits to be unfurled when the common enemy being defeated, the field is to be disputed by combatants contending for the spoil, exasperated by the reproach of mutual treachery.

We will give another short extract from the last mentioned publication, and then we will have done with our pamphlets.

"9. In this view, contemplating with an equal eye our *Government*, our *Laws*, and our *Religion*, all together making up the glorious fabrick of the *British Constitution*, and taking them in the full soul of their design, we behold them originating in the spirit of wisdom, and adapted to the purposes of virtue. The desire of rendering us a great nation, they have not fettered by the fear of allowing us to be a free one. From the operation of government in an established monarchy like our own, we expect, Sire, much practical good, but we look not for perfection. We think, that if it be administered so as to consult the general comfort, and thereby to insure the general tranquillity, it has accomplished the main purposes for which it was formed. If, in a growing empire, and with much of civil liberty, heated into licentiousness, to contend with, it be fitted to produce that portion of good in the heterogeneous mass of society which our corrupt natures admit of, it is a valuable government; is such a government as in reason we must approve, in policy we must uphold. That its regulations do not embrace every local interest, is no argument against its more comprehensive efficacy. That it is incompetent to awe into obedience all who live under its authority, will surprise no one who considers the changes in human objects, the violence of human passions, and the imperfection of human institutions. Government cannot reform, it can only curb and restrain; it cannot change, it can only humanize the evil propensities of man, and can only so far humanize them as it is seconded in its endeavours by the sober voice of the community.

10 "The spirit of disobedience, indeed, which is gone abroad, a crime of no light magnitude where conscience has to hold the scales of judgment and Heaven to punish the perversion of righteousness; this spirit opposes alike every institution, and calumniates every means used for the public peace and happiness. But no man will be forward to accuse civil government of increasing his poverty, or diminishing his comforts, who considers how much of individual suffering may be laid to the charge of passions which he has taken no pains to subdue, and of indulgencies, which, without the means of support, he might have known would end in his disgrace. That we are willing, when the insanity of our conduct comes home to us, to charge our misfortunes where we can, and to impute defect to any one rather than to ourselves, is no proof that our rulers are incapable, or unprincipled; that they either see not our interest, or care not for our happiness. With better views men would find civil regulations of a better tendency; would discern them in the exercise of a fuller wisdom and of a more beneficent influence. Public measures have rarely been known, in their general operation, to be against the

public interest. Righteousness towards the community is the only sacred foundation, the only solid support of the British throne; nor is it possible it should last through a single reign without such a support.

"11. But if the British Government be entitled to our esteem, neither can we withdraw it from the *Administration* of that government. Towards your Majesty's present Ministers we profess no undue partiality. We have seen them subject to infirmity like other men; subject, like other men, to error in their best judgments, and to reverses of fortune in their happiest measures. But although we may not, and indeed cannot alike approve of every part of their conduct, yet believing that they have acted with fidelity and deserved well of their country, the *People of England*, in their hour of need, will no more desert them than that throne to which their counsels have given stability.

"12. Called to the helm at an awful period, we have witnessed them not always triumphant, but often deserving of being so; not always able to assimilate their large views with the little local interests of surrounding states, but evermore intending, and frequently accomplishing, high designs of virtue, and imparting to the drooping spirits of the Continent an animation that inspired them to oppose, and an exertion that enabled them to subdue, the common oppressor of mankind. We have beheld them, in the teeth of an Opposition more strikingly democratical than ever marked the annals of this kingdom, one unhappy reign alone excepted, preserving us in safety at home, covering us with glory abroad, and restoring to the nations of the world, in the midst of their despair, an almost miraculous security." (*Declaration of the People of England*, p. 9—13.)

We cannot leave our subject without declaring our concurrence with the opinions of this writer in behalf of things as they are; not because we are adverse to improvement, for we think that all human institutions, whether civil or religious, ought to participate in that course of advancement into which human intelligence naturally disposes every thing under its controul, when it is itself invested with all its natural freedom of operation, and its rights and privileges of culture; but because we think that the great excellence of our political predicament is this,—that it blends with an incessantly operative principle of improvement a jealous principle of conservation, the happy tendency of which is at once to moderate its impulse and to secure its progression. We are not very anxious about the pedigree of our constitution, nor care whether there existed or not in the Saxon institutions, the lineaments of our present liberties. There is, as it seems to us, great folly and danger in searching amongst records of barbarous times for the titles and muniments of our present system. It never had its day of purity, nor is there any theory in which its standard can be found. It works well,—and does its business, and we want no more. That the rights of humanity were better recognized and expressed in the first military es-

tablishments which succeeded to the overthrow of the Roman power, than in that old and worn-out fabric of despotism; that in the early combinations of petty proprietors, under the first allodial divisions of the conquered lands, the origin of towns, vills, and burghs, might be obscurely traced; that in those rude associations of free and martial men, a root of liberty was buried to spring again, at a subsequent period, with a firm and regular growth; that the feudal system which succeeded the loose and desultory state of the Anglo-Saxon governments, did no more than suspend the growth of this ancient root of freedom, while it was adding secretly to its nourishment and maturing its own destruction; that in that system of institutions was potentially contained the principles of a manly freedom, which, as its rigorous distinctions wore away, became gradually unfolded, till, through a happy series of consequences, and often under a very unpromising exterior, a more cheerful order of things slowly and invisibly coming on, disclosed the beginnings of a steadier government, and the more permanent securities of freedom; that from the reign of Edward the First, in which the royal power of taxing the demesnes of the crown, without consent of parliament, was given up, to the death of the first Charles, a pretty regular advancement, amidst some relapses, is traceable, when by the silent accumulation of a fulminating force it exploded at a time when there was no sufficient stay or security to resist it; that from the death of Charles the First, the stages, by which our liberties advanced, became more apparent, by the dispersion of great estates, the increasing dependence of the crown, the abolition of military tenures, the acquisition of the right of impeachment, that formidable engine of popular jealousy, the jurisdiction of elections, the exception of members from arrest, the postponement of the royal veto to the end of the parliamentary discussion, and a variety of other accessions of weight and privilege to the scale of the commons, too many here to enumerate, we are ready to admit; but the inference we draw from all this is, that there never existed any model of perfect liberty in the ancient practice of the British constitution, but that our system of representation, and actual state of our government and constitution under which so much felicity has been attained, found their true title to our reference on the very obscurity of their lineage and pedigree,—not on any fiat of conventional authority, but on the marks they bear of the progressive improvement of each succeeding era. Observing all this, we entertain a sober mistrust of all speculative change, all factitious reforms of a systematic and professing character; we shrink from disturbing, as we have before intimated, arrangements into which the constitution of our country has been im-

perceptibly mellowed by its own inherent principle of adaptation to the condition of society. We wish it still to be slowly acted upon by public opinion, and to receive the impress from time to time of an expanding intelligence: we wish to see a constant watchfulness in the different departments of our political system, a frequent inquiry into abuses, and a temperate application of suitable remedies; and for this reason we deprecate and abhor every proposition of reform that the mean-minded selfishness of party men suggests in a spirit of opposition to their adversaries in power, or the favourites of an abused populace propose for the perpetuation of unfounded discontents; for in such reforms we see a speedy end of all that ages have done for us; we see the death of the eagle from arrows winged with the feathers of its own plumage.

We are friends to influence, and we care not for the sound or the scandal of the word. We will not conceal our conviction that our constitution can have no practical existence without it. It holds its place by the oldest of all laws,—the charter of necessity. The sun of prerogative has set, and we have marked with gratitude that crescent and secondary power, rising as its successor to fill the void in the system. To a government of force has succeeded a government of favour; and if we destroy this substitute, we can have, by no possibility, any free and permanent government at all. The vessel of the state is sailing in a strong gale with her jury masts; if a shot from an enemy should carry those away, perish she must, do what we will. She has only these to keep her on her way in obedience to the helm; and to this we are to trust to save her from those maxims of the Whigs, which in Mr. Fox's day composed the creed of the committees and sub-committees of reform; the proceedings of which are to be found in Mr. Wyvill's collection of political papers.—“That boroughs in their present state are a public nuisance;” that “the gross abuse in the representation originates chiefly in royal innovation;” that “the ancient practice of our constitution ought to be restored;” that “the statute of qualification was truly a statute of disfranchisement;” that “the continuance of the same parliament beyond a single session, is a virtual annihilation of the commons of England;” that “the fabric of the present House of Commons ought to be utterly abolished.” All which and many more such maxims were thought worthy of adoption by the general committee, and received the signature of C. J. Fox. Against these lying principles, and ferocious dogmas, we earnestly desire to be protected; and we know of nothing that can save us from them, but the conservative operation of that influence (the necessary quantum of which we are not now considering,—it is liable to excess and abuse, and must be watched

like other sources of power) of which it has been the constant cry of silly or crafty men that it is destroying our liberties. It is this influence which protects us from the tyranny to which universal suffrage, and annual parliaments, would infallibly conduct us, and from that aristocracy of wealth in which the kingly prerogative would be speedily merged.

It is to this influence that the men calling themselves Whigs would to-morrow resort, if to-morrow were to see them in power. They would, of necessity, give themselves the lie ere their administration was a week old. Popular favour! what would it do for them? Could they govern by it? Could they govern *with* it? They know they could not. Were they to make the experiment, they might float, indeed, by their levity for a short interval upon the surface of that flux medium, but the great water-flood would soon receive and engulf them; soon would they be drifted down to that vagrant and stormy element taught by them to despise its embankments.

The Whigs, as they are called, were in place and power in 1806. It was a short opportunity; but they made the most of it to show what manner of men they were. Our allies were disgusted,—our enemies derided our baffled enterprizes,—favouritism found its way upwards and downwards through all the offices from the greatest to the lowest,—new places of office were justified,—pensions were multiplied,—the tax on income was doubled,—and influence, the most unblushing, was employed in the general election.

It was about the same time that the Review, which is the best expounder of modern Whiggism, made some new and notable discoveries in politics. It found out, for the confutation of Mr. Cobbett's charges of the abandonment by the Whigs when in office of their professions and engagements to the people on the subject of parliamentary reform, that the representations and positions of that writer were "inflammatory" and "exaggerated," and particularly his standing maxim—that all our evils were produced by the motley texture of the House of Commons:—that placemen were better in parliament than elsewhere;—that the influence of great families in elections of members was rather beneficial than pernicious;—that the traffic in boroughs was in no danger of going to such an extent as to put the constitution to hazard;—that that country was the happiest in which the aristocracy was the most numerous and most diversified as to the sources of its influence;—that in a country where rank, wealth, and office contributed the chief sources of influence over individuals, it was proper that rank, wealth, and office should make the greatest number of its legislators;—that in spite of placemen, and pensioners, and purchasers of boroughs, and nominees of

Lords, the House of Commons unquestionably contained a sufficient number and variety of persons to represent all the different opinions, and maintain all the different views of policy which existed in the country at large;—that there was no sentiment so democratical, no accusation so uncourtly, no interest so local, but it found there a voice to support and assist it; their discussions were sufficiently free and frequent; they were made sufficiently public; they excited a sufficient share of general attention and interest; while this was the case there was no danger of losing our liberties.

“There are some subordinate advantages,” continues the Whig-interpreter of the constitution, “derived to the public by making them the electors of their lawgivers, and we should be well pleased, therefore, to see that privilege extended; but it goes so little to the essence of our constitutional freedom, that we cannot help thinking our Parliaments would be as useful and as valuable as they ever were, though they were mostly composed of persons chosen by lot, or by rotation, from the individuals of a certain fortune and education in each of the counties.”

And again:

“In order to exercise their constitutional functions with safety, it becomes necessary for the King and the great families to exercise them in the Lower House, not *against* the United Commons of England, but *among* them: but not in their own character and directly,—but *covertly*, and mingled with those whom it is substantially their interest and duty to *controul*.”

And in another place:

“When a seat in Parliament is offered for sale, a pretty fair competition, we think, is open to politicians of all descriptions. The independent and well-affected part of the nation is far richer than Government, or the peerage; and if all seats in Parliament could be honestly and openly sold for ready money, we have no sort of doubt that a very great majority would be purchased by persons unconnected with the Treasury or the House of Lords.”

We have introduced the above Whig aphorisms, not because we think they deserve censure, though they are rather too strong for our constitutional prejudices, but because they show what a versatile being a Whig is, and how necessary it is to know the political position of the party to which he belongs, before we can predicate any thing of his political opinions. Compare the sentiments, to which we have been adverting, of this Reviewer, with his views taken at other times of the subject of parliamentary reform, and we shall find that a polar distance divides them. It may be worth while, too, to contrast the animadversions of Mr. Fox at a meeting of the electors of Westminster in 1782, when not only every species of influence appeared to be

reprobated by him, but something like universal suffrage, and a positive abolition of the veto, seemed to be in his contemplation, with the conduct pursued by him and his friends during the short interval of their ministerial elevation. Mr. Fox's tact was not fine, and some of the subalterns of his party, and particularly the patriots of the present moment, have better understood the way in which their cause is to be served. It is of the silent influence, not of the active prerogatives of the Crown, from which they apprehend danger. They would even have the prerogative of the veto again engrafted into the practice of the constitution. And why all this? because, if all influence could be made to cease, and nothing mediate, conciliating, or preventive be left standing between the King and the people, the power and dignity of the Crown would be brought into collision with the democratic elements of the constitution: and this is precisely as the case stood between the Monarch and the subject in the unhappy days of Charles the First;—the prerogative had sunk to nothing, and its place had not been filled up by influence; neither the means nor management of which was then understood. Charles came into the field without knowing the extent of his weakness, calling upon his prerogative as vainly as Richard for his horse. It is agreeable to the maxims of political philosophy to talk of the balance between the several powers of the Crown, of the aristocracy, and of the people, as recognized by the constitution in name and in function; but in verity and effect no such equilibrium exists. There is one great arena on which the monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy contend;—the Lower House of Parliament. The King and the Lords must be, and are, in a manner, there represented; and on this point we are perfectly of the opinion which was entertained by the Reviewer, whom we have so profusely quoted, while he was in that part of his orbit, which may be called his perihelion. We agree with him that the "reign of influence and freedom began together;" and will here leave him to reconcile that maxim as well as he can with his subsequent opinion—that a "government of influence, is necessarily the government of a faction, which has made itself illegally independent both of the Sovereign and the people."

Far are we from maintaining that the influence of the executive government may not be excessive. There are bounds which it cannot with safety be permitted to pass; but these bounds are perhaps relative rather than stationary. It must depend upon the antagonist influence which it has to oppose in the wealth, weight, and activity operating against power merely as power; and we are far from thinking that as a more active state of mind discovers itself in the people, the result of an improved intelli-

gence, the defensive means of executive government can with safety be reduced.

Such may be the favourite maxim of our popular philosophers, and of our profound adepts in that grand alchemy which, by force of education, is to put a new mind and heart into the vulgar; this may be so; but whether the task of government will be thereby facilitated, will depend upon the proportion of this improved intelligence which will be turned into the channels of dutiful moderation, and virtuous submission.

With respect to the state of the representation, it may not be what is called equal or proportionate; but it is what is much better—it is virtual and effective. By the House of Commons, as at present composed, the country may not be numerically, but it is morally represented; which it certainly could not be, were it composed as it would be, if none could get there but by the favour of the multitude. In its mixed and multifarious condition it diffusively represents the minds, the habits, the employments, the intelligence of all orders and classes; and all experience shows that among those who enter that great assembly by avenues the most private, are found the best and most independent, and certainly not the least enlightened, trustees of the public. To this shape and structure, somewhat irregular, perhaps, but admirably suited to the diversified character and condition of the being to whose use it is applied, our political system has been brought by a train of fortuitous occurrences, appearing, at the times of their happening, perhaps, to be pregnant with contrary results to those to which they have given birth. The different crises and emergencies by which its great destiny has been gradually matured, have doubtless been acted upon by a vigorous intelligence and a native majesty of mind early directing the views of Englishmen towards a noble freedom. A manly heart, a loyal devotion, a religious courage, were the characteristics of our earliest ancestors, and the agents by which, under God, the moral order of things was driven onwards in an irregular and vacillating progression: but our frame of government, usually called the constitution, owes the strength of its texture to something above human contrivance;—it is the product of an involuntary development of unforeseen tendencies, and accidental combinations; not admirable for its symmetries and proportions, but moulded and fashioned to the purposes, and wants, and passions of man with a singular suitableness;—hardened by centuries passing over it to endure the roughest treatment; and making up in convenience whatever it may want in grace and comeliness. As it never was conventionally made, so if it should be unmade by those presumptuous men who are for making it better, we may strive in

vain to make it again. Our votes may destroy it; our vows can never restore it. If the persons calling themselves Whigs should in an evil hour defeat the Government on a vital question, the first act of their administration must be to stop the breach they themselves will have made, and to prevent the worst men in the country from rushing in: their first contention will be with that republican and atheistical press, debauched by their purses and their patriotism.

As there is much to daunt in the present state of things in the country, so there is much to cheer. The strength of our system is greatly tried; but in that trial is evinced its resources. There never yet, we firmly believe, existed the empire that could have endured the assaults under which our own still stands—stricken, indeed, but not disabled. It is its glory still to be serene, and mild, and beneficent in the midst of its agitations and provocations. The legislative and judicial and executive functions are all in a healthy state. The vessel rides on the stormy element, with its sails set, and its rudder still controuling its course. If we were asked how this comes to be the case, we should be apt to say, that its real cause is to be found in a certain equipoise of power and reciprocity of action; an oscillation, if we may so say, of the various classes into which society, political and moral, is distributed;—from causes not within human controul, nor owing their existence to human foresight or contrivance. It has proceeded in a manner not unlike that of the physical system of man, in which Nature has created a secret balance, a mysterious economy of compensations, by which, in the midst of a perpetual recurrence of partial and temporary injuries, the whole structure is wonderfully sustained. Its course has corresponded with the great arrangements of nature, and the best gifts of God to his creatures, in thus gradually unfolding its blessings. It depends upon no forced or superinduced principles of action. It has nothing speculative in its nature. It neither supposes nor requires the suppression of the selfish passions. It stipulates for no extraordinary degrees of self-devotion. It adopts what cannot be extinguished—the movements of the passions; but it has modified them into never-ceasing springs of useful activity, mutual checks, and silent securities. By affording scope for it, to a qualified extent, it has extracted from ambition its hurtful properties. Power there must be in every state, and power has a natural tendency to become condensed in a single ruler;—this is provided for, and the struggle is prevented. Property and influence tend to accumulation,—they may accumulate harmlessly in the British Constitution—the state has a fund for their gratification at once cheap and splendid. The people also must have power as such;—a free passage is open to them. They

have their organs, and, as we have above maintained, a virtual and effective representation. The restlessness of man is every where turned into useful channels. Power is every where so distributed, as to operate as a check upon itself; and, by the impulse of indirect forces, the state is urged on majestically and slowly in one uniform line of progression and improvement. It is altogether a mighty and magnificent whole, linked in fellowship with that scheme of analogy which unites under one bond our nature, our morals, and our religion; and it is all, to speak humanly, under subjection to that long exercised spirit of political prudence which is the distinction and excellence of the British character.

The great and happy characteristic of this distribution of power is this, that it is not frittered among individuals; it resides with the different orders of the community, in masses, and corporate interests. Every man of light and leading is necessarily a member of a class; his objects are the objects of the order to which he belongs, and his efforts are usually comprised within this orbit of exertion; if he ventures in politics to act a single, he must generally act an eccentric part; and his course becomes dangerous and destructive to himself, if not imbecile and absurd in operation and display. Of this classification and reciprocation of power, less the result of positive institution than of involuntary and casual organization, ancient polity knew nothing. Its systems were sometimes metaphysically enchanting, but they had in them little or nothing of the nature of man. They were for the most part framed in contradiction to his nature. The commonwealth of Rome was never really free. It was full of distrust; it was afraid of human improvement; the introduction of philosophy and the arts were regarded as the forerunners of national ruin. The Spartan government was still more forced and unnatural; it was made only for soldiers. Athens had national pride, and the air and semblance of freedom, but it would be ridiculous to talk of the Athenian constitution. It could not endure its own great men, and in a moral view it was the meanest, most frivolous, and most unjust of all communities. In a word, every ancient government that was not arbitrary, depended upon superinduced and precarious principles. It had no cement in man's real nature: it allowed little or no play to the passions. Some glimpse, indeed of the balanced system of which we have said so much occurred to the wisest of the ancients, but it came and departed as a pleasing vision, too fugitive to be steadily contemplated; — *nimum lubricus aspici*. How hardly would they have been convinced, that in a remote Island in the Northern Seas, this vision would one day be realised; but how much greater would have been their astonishment to be told that the day would arrive, when this country, so distinguished among

the nations of the earth, would contain a description of persons, many of them largely participating in its blessings, discontented with their state of substantial happiness, because not agreeable to some untried theory of perfection, and disposed to risk their real privileges in the pursuit of ambiguous improvements; and a still larger number malignantly determined for the gratification of their selfish ambition, to destroy this work of centuries and singular gift of Providence.

The Government under which we live has, therefore, great claims to our obedience. Obedience is an Englishman's interest no less than his duty. We do not say that an administration may not so mis-conduct itself as to justify systematic opposition. We do not deny that where the general management is dangerously wrong, though chequered by partial acts of a beneficial tendency, the whole may not be reasonably opposed, for the sake of displacing men unworthy of their seats: nor do we question but that it is right, under such circumstances, that opposition should be made with a corporate spirit and confederate strength. There is even a security in this mode of attacking in a mass. A body of men can seldom hold together except in fundamental points: violent propositions tend to disunion; and thus in the mutual awe of a large society of moral beings, there is always something to controul the excesses of temerity. But if the country has been prosperous under its existing rulers, we think it not too much to say, that where certain measures are of doubtful expediency, it is the duty of a patriot politician to incline to the side of Government; and in general, in the case supposed, to afford them a systematic support. It is the part of the generous and candid so to act. We are in duty, and by interest, bound to honour the King, and to respect the power with which the constitution has invested him of choosing his ministers. If we can, indeed, lay our hands upon our bosoms, and with the singleness and simplicity of truth affirm that we believe them incapable of good, or disposed to ill, it is another thing; but if we know their measures to be in the main beneficial, it evinces great profligacy of heart to oppose their measures on account of the men; and still greater to traduce them to the country. The selfish acts of such a body of men is of the most wretched description: they seldom stop with deluding the people, and inflaming discontent; they are found meanly capable of disparaging the successes of their country, and viewing its reverses with a vindictive complacency. To be mild, Government must be secure; to be gentle, it must be strong. Weakness produces jealousy, and jealousy injustice. It has been so with most republican states: they have been violent from want of confidence in themselves. They have

always been occupied with domestic quarrels; and every minute derangement has shaken them to the centre. They dare not relax the severity of their laws, where mercy should temper justice: the immediate authors of a law cannot without extreme danger interrupt its course, set aside its execution, or moderate its rigour. The curtain of hopeless sorrow is drawn round their tribunals, and no ray from the source of mercy can penetrate. In England the law which with its triple sanction is of peculiar sacredness, bends to circumstances, and is gentle in its severity. Admirable, too, in respect to the liberty of the subject, is the unity and solidity of the executive power. Bound down, and consolidated, it presents a definable object to the people, against which to direct their caution. It is its great excellence to be an integral part of an entire system, deriving its security not from its own active and operative strength, so much as from the action and counteraction of a balanced constitution. By its solitary splendour it stands out of the reach of ambition. A deep fosse lies between it and the circle which surrounds it. To the rim of this circle a passage is clear to the emulation of the virtuous and the brave, but so are things constituted in this happy state, that ambition sets bounds to itself, and expires by its own exertions. Borne upwards by the gale, the aspiring individual rises till he leaves the atmosphere of the people, and vanishes in splendid obscurity. Such is the faithful portraiture of the constitution under which we live; and this is the system of society, political and moral, which we call upon our countrymen at this moment of trial, manfully to defend, against its domestic enemies,—a restless multitude of persons, geographically speaking, our countrymen, but to all moral intents and purposes as entirely strangers to us, as the inhabitants of interior Africa, or the natives of the polar circle.

ART. II.—*The Comedies of Aristophanes.* By T. Mitchell, A.M. late Fellow of Sidney-Sussex College, Cambridge. Vol. I. 8vo. pp. 454. Murray. London, 1820.

THE volume before us contains two comedies of Aristophanes, the *Acharnians* and the *Knights*, in an English dress. It is the first time, we believe, that they have been translated into our tongue.

Aristophanes still remains in a mutilated state. A complete edition of the comic poet has long since been pointed out as a desideratum. The folios of Kuster and Portus are inaccessible

to students in general. Brunck has given us the best text, and, by means of the various manuscripts which he consulted, freed it from many usurpations. But it is printed in a type, so painfully small, that, in spite of all his industry, it is deformed with numberless errors. His unsparing hostility also to the particle $\gamma\epsilon$ has not unfrequently been indulged at the expense of metrical exactness; and he has retained readings which do no honour to his critical discernment. He makes, it is true, an amusing apology for the imperfections of his book. Our readers will scarcely believe that, with the utmost naïveté, he ascribes them partly to the noise made by little Master Brunck, who, in the midst of the severe labours of the commentator, was capering about his father's library, and partly to the gossiping visits of some worthy neighbours, who broke in upon his retirements. We will, therefore, give them his own words :

“*Mirari subit, lætarique bonam fortunam frequentioribus istiusmodi lapsibus mihi cavisse; maximè quum recordor, partem haud minimam istarum fabularum a me descriptam iterum fuisse, dum in musco meo vel ludebat filius meus, quo animum meum nihil magis advertit oblectatque, vel confabulantur boni quidam viri, qui quot fere diebus horisque matutinis ad me visere solent.*”

The unexpiated fault, however, of Brunck's edition, is the omission of the old scholia, which are esteemed the most valuable specimens of the kind; an omission, poorly supplied by annotations, which being critical rather than explanatory, administer little or no aid to the interpretation of so difficult an author. Many scholars, therefore, have testified some impatience for a new standard edition of Aristophanes. There are now, they think, more abundant materials than ever for the undertaking: for in addition to the collations of the manuscripts given us by Kuster, Beck, and others, there are the ample emendations of Bentley, and of Porson,* to enrich them. But whoever undertakes the task, must be upon his guard against the parental weakness of Brunck, and take especial care not to be at home to the morning loungers of his neighbourhood.

That the translators of the comic poet should have been few, must be ascribed to the difficulty, we had almost said, to the impossibility of transfusing him from his own language. Of the English versions, the oldest is that of the *Plutus*, in 1651, under the title of “*Hey for Honesty! Down with Knavery!*” by Thomas Randolph, author of “*The Muses' Looking-glass.*” Another translation of the same play appeared in 1659 by an

* Porson, *Aristophanica*. Dobree.

anonymous hand. In Stanley's "Lives of the Philosophers," 1687, there is an imperfect translation of "The Clouds." Theobald translated "The Plutus." Of "The Clouds," the first entire translation was by James White, with the quaint title of "A Comedy, written by Aristophanes, the Wittiest Man of his Age, against Socrates, who was the Wisest and the Best." The next in order of time are "The Plutus," by Fielding; "The Frogs," by Dunster; "The Birds," by a Member of one of the Universities; and the easy and flowing version of "The Clouds," by Cumberland. These were reprinted in one collection about eight years ago. There are entire translations of all the plays into the Italian, by Rosatini; and into French, by Poinset: and there is the masterly performance of Wieland in German. There are also detached translations in French and Italian. Madame Dacier translated "The Plutus." The same play, together with "The Clouds," was rendered by Terrucci into Italian. "The Birds" was translated also into French by Boivin le Cadet, according to Mr. Gibbon, one of the best scholars that France ever produced.* We presume that Mr. Mitchell has an entire translation in his view; of which the two plays, contained in the present volume, are published as specimens.

Yet, whilst we cheerfully acknowledge that a familiar acquaintance with Aristophanes is necessary to a perfect conception of the flexibility and force, the exquisite polish and endless varieties of the Greek language,—that we cannot obtain a faithful portraiture of the manners and habits of the Greeks, but through their scenic representations, and that of these we can obtain no satisfactory information without much intercourse with Aristophanes; and whilst for this purpose we are solicitous for an accurate amendment of his text, and an ample elucidation of his obscurities;—we can go no further. Our vows for an entire translation of him into English are by no means ardent. Mr. Mitchell, it is true, has, with a very proper feeling, avoided the interpretation of much that is offensive, and made large sacrifices to taste and delicacy. Considering it, however, to be a most important part of our function to discountenance every literary effort, which has a tendency to taint the ingenuous purity of youth, and to vitiate the moral taste of maturer years, we are far from being eager for the naturalization of this ancient classic amongst us. The most chastized translation, we apprehend, must give a plain intimation where the obnoxious passages are to be found, which are so studiously

* Gibbon. Misc. Works, vol. v. p. 586.

omitted. In addition to their ordinary instruments, the Lexicon and the Latin version, they who are moderately tinctured with Greek, will be enabled to supply the *lacunæ*, which are thus brought under their observation, and which would not perhaps otherwise have invited their attention. The difficulties, however, of this author are, in general, so truly discouraging, that students of that age, which is the most susceptible of moral stain, cannot have acquired sufficient erudition for the systematic perusal of his comedies without the aid of a translation. Speaking, therefore, with ingenuousness, we could have wished that the Athenian poet had still been permitted to repose in the libraries of the learned, veiled in the mysteries of his native language. Much would have been gained to decorum, and little lost to literature: for we have been long convinced, nor has Mr. Mitchell's attempt shaken our conviction, that Aristophanes is incapable of translation. Point, wit, and personal ridicule are not easily interchanged between contemporary tongues. How extravagant then is the expectation, that the humour, the turn, the joke of Attic diction, deriving their effect from customs and allusions, that have for ages past away, should be otherwise than lifeless and vapid by transfusion!

With these feelings, it was not without regret that we received the information given us by the editor of the plays, published in 1812, that the study of Aristophanes was becoming prevalent in our Universities. Our own recollections made us doubtful of the fact; but an inquiry into the present practice of the lecture room has relieved our anxiety; for we find, that with the exception of "The Plutus," which, defiled as it is with much impurity, is of an ethical character, and by some critics has been classed with the reformed or middle comedy, the plays of that writer form no part of the classical course either at Oxford or Cambridge. Indeed the grossness of the comic bard, whom, in the endless mutabilities of human doctrine, it is now the fashion to place in the number of moral and ethical teachers, is of that description, which peculiarly renders him an unfit companion for youth. Indelicacy, in its fullest strength of meaning, is still a word too delicate, to describe the phrases and allusions which he deals in by wholesale. His beauties are for ever overshadowed by contiguous deformities; and his beauties are unfortunately so exquisite as must, to young and unconfirmed minds, in some degree consecrate his deformities. He goes infinitely beyond the licence claimed by Boileau for himself and his brother satirists, of calling things by their names. Words now by common consent banished from the decent intercourses of society, and

condemned to the exclusive use of the low and the profligate, images whose very entrance into the mind is prevented by the triple guards of religion, virtue, and example, unblushingly take their place in the dramas of Aristophanes, by the side of sentiments, breathing the soul of moral purity, and sentences polished to the last refinement of Attic diction. Nor are the weeds that thus choak the soil only of casual growth. They are not unfrequently cultured with the same care which he expends on the choicest flowers. That which affrighted modesty cannot name;—the most loathsome of our infirmities;—all that we strive to forget, appears in Aristophanes, dressed in the most studied attire, and clothed in the most graceful folds of that wonderful language, which exalts the great, embellishes the beautiful, and adds new grossness to the gross. So instinctively, as it were, is he attracted towards obscenity, that even whilst he has a high moral purpose in view, and soars with the flight of an eagle in pursuit of it, he suddenly abandons his quarry, to rake in the mud and filth of the dunghill. In that beautiful passage in “The Clouds” for instance, which begins thus,

Ἀλλ' οὐν λιπαρὸς γε καὶ ευανθῆς ἐν γυμνασίοις διατρέψεις.—κ. τ. λ.

and whilst in that fine dialogue between the two allegorical personages, he is indulging in the most exquisite panegyrick upon the old discipline of Athens, opposed to the corrupt manners of his own time, and pouring forth the choicest treasures of ethical wisdom, he suddenly wings his downward flight, as if into a more congenial region, to revel amidst the grossest images of Grecian debauchery.

It may indeed be conceded that all this is not without its natural corrective: for his pictures are too disgusting to be sensual, and his allusions too naked to be alluring. The cup in which he mixes his poison is not always administered by the hands of the Graces. He is often an inefficient instrument of evil, and pandars too clumsily for the passions. He is not, therefore, to be considered as so dangerous a writer, as those (the dramatick authors of the German school, for instance,) who corrupt the heart without offending the ear. Yet with all these antidotes, he is still dangerous. The unintermitted expression of obscene things, in obscene language, must gradually wear out the ingenuous purity of youth, even in minds of the most favoured structure, as the physical organs become by habit insensible to the foulest effluvia. Nor is this disgusting impurity expiated by the sublime and virtuous purposes which his admirers attribute to his Muse. The most forgiving candour, which the

classical enthusiast can exercise towards a favourite author, the warmest partiality which a laborious editor can feel for the ancient about whom he is occupied, can suggest no legitimate defence for his transgressions. They are unredeemed by all the beauties which adorn his page, and all the wit that sparkles in his dialogue.

That Aristophanes was a severe corrector of the Athenian vices, that he was peculiarly sensitive to the follies and caprices and cruelties of that "complex Nero" the sovereign people of Athens, and scourged them with an unrelenting hand, we by no means reluctantly admit. But to see him placed by Cumberland, and the Schlegels (whom Mr. Mitchell implicitly follows) in the moral chair, and to be invited to his lectures, as if ethical truth came mended from his tongue,—is an unreasonable exercise of our forbearance. Much may be indulged to the enthusiasm of commentators and translators, who naturally feel a paternal tenderness for the subject of their labours: but when this enthusiasm betrays them into insane admiration; when, like the lovers and madmen of Shakspeare, they have

————— such seething brains
Such shaping fantasies, that apprehend
More than cool reason ever comprehends,

we must take care not to look through the same distempered medium, but to frame our estimate by a cooler and sedater vision.

If it be said, and more than this is said, that it was to give efficacy to his satire, and poignancy to his reproaches, that he flirted and coquetted with the Athenian mind; that to correct the morals of his countrymen, he condescended to gratify their tastes; that he stroked and caressed them as it were with one hand, that he might more effectually chastize them with the other; that we must not be too fastidious, but take so agreeable a writer for better and worse, the moral poet and the unrestrained libertine, the wisdom of the philosopher and the gaiety of the buffoon; that it was more practicable to attain his end by acquiescing in the prevailing modes of comic writing, than by a vain effort to introduce chaster and purer topics, which might endanger that end; that the same auditors, who hissed Cratinus, one of their favourite poets, from the stage, because in one of his pieces he had stinted them of their usual allowance of ribaldry, would have visited Aristophanes with the same indignity, had he presumed to rebel against the coarse habits of the Athenian theatre; if this be urged in behalf of Aristophanes, let Aristophanes himself be heard in reply. Amongst the eleven comedies of the poet, which time has spared, "The

Plutus" * is, we think, one which, though by no means free from verbal grossness, contains a comparatively small proportion of the feculence and indecency of his other plays. It has also much less to gratify that appetite for personal scandal, which was so prevalent in Athens, and which had received from Aristophanes some of its most delicious repasts : yet the piece was eminently successful. Here then is one proof at least, that he might have gratified the Athenian mob without pampering their sensuality. Such also was the popularity of Aristophanes, so complete was his mastery over his auditory, that we do not over-rate his influence, by presuming that he might by degrees have given the public taste a better direction, and brought virtue and delicacy, had it so pleased him, instead of vice and depravity, into fashion at the theatre. Let it be recollected also, that Aristophanes was, in a great measure, the framer of the old comedy. It came to him, says Mr. Mitchell, in a rough and unfinished state, and was re-cast by his hands. It is not then overtasking the astonishing powers of the poet, when we venture to conjecture, that they were not incompetent to a reformation of the Athenian stage. He who could with impunity laugh at the crimes and follies of Athens, tell the people to their faces that they were a set of shallow, self-conceited, presumptuous egotists, and the dupes of every one who pampered their vanity; who had so boundless a sway over the government and the people, as to be applauded for the severest animadversions upon both, and rewarded with the most tumultuous approbation, and the highest honours of the theatre for saying that, which another comic poet (Anaxandrides) expiated by a slow and cruel death, might surely have more effectually legislated for the drama, and more completely reformed the vices of the old comedy, than the decree which was afterwards passed to restrain it. Aristophanes, however, aimed at no such purpose. With the servile alacrity of a mere minister of pleasure, whether he was required to gratify the malevolence of the low by insults on the high, or to serve up to the diseased cravings of Athens a banquet of lewdness and sensuality, he was indefatigable in his calling. Such was the poet whom the new literary fashion of the day has erected into a moral censor, and a philosophic instructor.

An apology for the obscenity of the poet is attempted to be

* appartient pour le fond, au genre de l'ancienne comédie; cependant, avec une grande modération dans la plaisanterie personnelle, et une teinte générale qui rapprochent de la comédie moyenne.

(Schlegel sur Litt. Dram. tom. i. p. 34.)

extracted by his translator* from the Phallic origin of the Greek comedy, and the daily spectacles, (emblematic representations interwoven in that hideous superstition,) which the eyes of men and women abroad and at home daily encountered. Charity, that thinketh no evil, prompts us to look back with pitying eyes upon those benighted minds, which walked in the darkness of the shadow so eloquently sketched by the Apostle, and rather hastily to adopt than austere to reject the extenuations that are proffered for the corruptions of the heathen world. Without urging a doubt, however, as to the genealogy ascribed to the Greek comedy, we must be allowed to remark that more than two centuries had now elapsed, during which the tragic exhibitions from their first dithyrambic origin having successively passed through the hands of Thespis, Phrynicus, and Æschylus, had been polished into the sedate majesty of Sophocles, and the finished pathos of Euripides; while comedy had made also considerable, if not equal advances from those licentious festivities, when at the celebration of the vintage,† a rude troop, smeared with the dregs of the grape and intoxicated with its juice, poured out their unpremeditated sarcasms, and unpolished buffooneries, to the bitter but elegant satire of Cratinus, and the rich and harmonious diction of Aristophanes. After so complete a transformation, nothing of its Bacchic origin could remain, but the time (the Dionysian festivals) appointed for its representation. Its obscenity, therefore, had little to do with its religious original. The fact is, that a long course of indulgence had made grossness a daily nourishment for the Athenian mind. But let us concede to Mr. Mitchell that the ancient comedy derived its licentiousness from the ceremonies of Bacchus, and what will Aristophanes gain by the admission? He whose empire over the public taste was so unbounded that he gave a new form to the Grecian comedy, might easily have divested it of its consecrated obscenities. Reverence for the religious institutions of his country formed no part of the character of a poet, who ridiculed, on more occasions than one, the very god of the festival, and handled Jupiter himself with the most unceremonious freedom.

Such are the suggestions, which present themselves to our minds, when a place amongst the moral teachers of antiquity is claimed for Aristophanes. How inefficacious, must have been the discipline of a master, upon the light, volatile, and thoughtless Athenians, who meets more than half-way the crimes, which

* Mitchell, *Prel. Discourse*, p. 25.† *Anacharsis*, tom. vi.

he rebukes, and who, instead of hurling his invective from the elevation of virtue, descends into the haunts of the vices, converses with them as acquaintances, and uses their lowest, and most familiar speech! We are not slow in yielding to the prince of comic poets the real and appropriate praise that is due to him, but we have kept ourselves uninfected with the contagion of that false criticism, which converts into a severe moralist and a virtuous preceptor, a poet gifted indeed with all the accomplishments of his age, but who, having dedicated his life to the lighter amusements of his countrymen, seems scarcely to have cherished a wish, or to have indulged an aspiration, beyond the dramatic crown of the festivals. The awful censorship of virtue belonged not to a writer, who, to tickle the ears of his plebeian audience, dealt most unsparingly in the lowest ribaldry, and to sooth their malignity, dragged into his scene, as an object of scoffing and ridicule, the purest and wisest character of the age; who violated the retirements of private life to bring into public contempt, and to mark for public vengeance, those who were either obnoxious to himself or the people; who, where neither vice nor folly could be imputed, made the accident of birth a reproach, and laughed at the most moral and pathetick poet of antiquity, because his mother was a vender of herbs; who destroyed as far as he could the moral distinctions, and enfeebled the motives to virtue, by lashing with equal ridicule a Socrates, and a Cleon, the foulest profligacy and the most spotless integrity. It is not for such a man suddenly to start up in the dignity and dress of virtue. Aphorisms of morality to come forth with effect, must have the support of character and the stamp of consistency.

The history of Athens will supply us with additional antidotes against this immoderate admiration. When the comedy of Aristophanes exercised its severe inquisition over public and private life, where are we to look for its moral fruits? What fashionable folly did it laugh down? Was plebeian pride rebuked by its ridicule, or the tyranny of the many abashed into mildness and forbearance? The audience indeed saw their own deformities pleasantly dressed up for their amusement. They laughed, and scarcely felt the satire. The satire besides was directed against them collectively; no individual was wounded or amended; every one acknowledged the sarcasm to be just, while the dexterity of self-love transferred it to his neighbour: all were amused, none reformed: they returned the next day to the very follies at which they had laughed, with a relish sharpened by the penance; and having indulged a hearty laugh at all that was high and consecrated amongst them—at Jupiter,

or Mercury, or Bacchus,—or gratified the levelling passion so prevalent in democracies in the ridicule of an eminent statesman, the next day they prostrated themselves with the meanest servility at the statues of the gods they had ridiculed, and swelled the retinue of the great man, who but a few hours before had been caricatured and libelled for their amusement. Such was the efficiency with which Aristophanes corrected the morals of his countrymen.

There can be no doubt, indeed, that he occasionally strikes at abuses which are lawful game to the comic or satiric writer. In the comedy of the Knights, the rapines and extortions of Cleon are painted to the life. It must have abated however the edge, as it diminished the merit of the satire, that it did not flow from an unpolluted source. Private resentment gave to it its force and direction, for Cleon had opposed the poet's registration as a citizen of Athens. Wieland, whose erudition confers no slight authority upon his opinions, tells us farther, that the poet was in the pay of the party of Nicias, the political opponent of Cleon. Unquestionably the selection of such a character was fortunate. He was a monster unredeemed by a single virtue, born to be despised, but determined to be great, who by the meanest assiduities to the people had from the lowest station ascended the giddiest heights of popularity. This was the miscreant, whose turbulent eloquence persuaded that infamous decree which inflicted death on the males, and reduced to slavery the women and children of Mitylene, after the unsuccessful revolt of that devoted city, and that too in open violation of a solemn treaty, and stifled the few compunctious feelings that appeared to be stirring in the bosoms of the Athenians.* Such was Cleon, whose varied turpitude may be compendiously summed up in a single phrase. He was a consummate demagogue; a character of such finished profligacy, that it might be suspected to have come down to us with blacker shades than belonged to it, but that the French revolution has rendered the most portentous magnitude of democratic crime familiar to our imaginations. After the gigantic villanies of Danton and Marat, those of Cleon are no longer incredible. But the satire of the piece is so neutralized by its buffoonery, that it seems little calculated for a powerful effect. Its whole humour consists in a contest for popular favour between Cleon and a sausage-vender, one of the lowest dregs of the people, who contends for, and at last wrests from him, says the French author of Anacharsis,† “ *l'empire de l'im-*

* Mitford's Hist. Greece, vol. iii. p. 183.

† Anacharsis, tom. vi.

pudence." In fact its impression seems to have been light and evanescent. The comedy however was enthusiastically applauded. The objects of the ridicule laughed off their spleen. The attack on the sovereign people was forgiven for the dexterous compliments with which the poet interspersed it, and forgotten in the graces of the poetry and the broad farce of the incidents. Aristophanes obtained the prize of victory—and Cleon remained in as great favour as ever.

All this by the sectarists of the comic poet is attributed to a dignified fearlessness, the noblest attribute of genius. And when we advert to the unlimited power and influence of Cleon at the time, we unreluctantly concede this praise to Aristophanes. It must not however be unqualified. Such were the established privileges of the old comedy, that personalities, however undisguised, were of its very essence. The poet was sure of protection from an audience, who relished nothing so much as reflections upon the great and powerful. It required, indeed, a still higher courage to be plain spoken to the people, and when we peruse these keen strokes of invective upon that tyrannical rabble, we find a respect for Aristophanes strongly stealing upon us, tempered indeed by the considerations which, as we have sufficiently explained already, restrain us from concurring in the unmeasured panegyric of his modern admirers. Surveyed, however, in this attitude, his muse almost commands our veneration. Every lineament of the portrait glows with the tints of nature and truth. But even the great powers of Aristophanes were below the demands of the outrageous reality. No invective, no satire, can be more than a mere shadowy outline of the sensual depravity, the alternate cowardice and cruelty, the fitful tyranny of that proud democracy, which when they sat to Aristophanes for their picture, had in their hands the executive, financial, and legislative powers; a combination of functions, according to Montesquieu, constituting a complete despotism. The crooked policy of Pericles had freed them from all restraint. Left to their own licentious and drunken wills, they exhibited all the freaks and caprices of the worst tyrants, who have been permitted to torment mankind. It was this plebeian tyranny which, with almost a dash of his pen, and a metrical felicity with which the scholar will be enraptured, (the force of which is something more than diluted by the sing-song imitation of Mr. Mitchell which we subjoin,) Aristophanes has powerfully delineated in the simple, but vigorous words put into the mouth of the Chorus in the third act of the *Knights*.

ὦ Δῆμε χαλὴν γ' ἔχεις
 Ἀρχὴν, οὗ πάντες ἀν-
 Θρωποὶ δέδασιν σ' ὡς-
 πρὸς ἄνδρα τυραννόν.
 Ἀλλ'—κ. τ. λ.

How much has been lost in rigorous simplicity, and how little gained in any other respect by Mr. Mitchell's translation, will be immediately felt by the classical student.

Honour, power, and high estate,
 Demus, mighty lord, hast thou!
 To thy sceptre small and great
 In obeisance lowly bow!
 Yet you're easy to his hand,
 Whoever cringes;
 Every fool you gape upon,
 Every speech your ear hath won,
 While your wits move off and on
 Their hinges.

Here, however, the dexterity with which the Demus repels the insinuation, and chaunts his own praises in reply to the Chorus is worthy of remark. The praise is so skilfully interposed, that it had no doubt the effect of silencing the growl of the intractable animal, whose temper Aristophanes had so well studied. The old man is to be sure a testy, cross-grained, sour fellow. But he has much good sense at bottom, which he displays on fit occasions; and as to his being the gull of knaves and flatterers, his credulity is only assumed, and his slumbers feigned, that he may pounce upon the rogues, who are cramming themselves at his expense. The people thus ridiculed and flattered, returned home unedified by the satire, but delighted with its humour, as cruel, as turbulent, and capricious as ever.

We have been led into this freedom of animadversion upon the merits of Aristophanes, because we see, or think we see, an undue zeal at work which is eager to bestow upon him a degree of praise far beyond his just rank amongst the writers of antiquity. When in subservience to this end, the laudable prepossessions against him which have been handed down to us from the wise and good who have gone before us, are attempted to be removed, and a poet, who has heretofore been ranked amongst the mere ministers of wanton and libertine gaiety, is about to be classed with the teachers of moral wisdom, our duty dictates at once the part we are to take. Grossness and morality have no affinities. The alliance is

forced and unnatural. We have already, we trust, shown that we have not thus spoken from an insensibility to the excellencies of the poet. *Non obtusa adeo gestamus pectora.* We have not ceased to feel the effects of that wonderful language, which with its variety of inflexions and infinity of combinations, at once faithfully interprets the most abstruse operations of human intelligence, and portrays the warmest emotions of the human heart. We are well aware also, that Aristophanes has exhibited the graces of that language in their highest perfection. Yet while we give him full credit for his just and manly severity against the Athenian vices; his detestation of the ruinous and expensive war into which his country was plunged; his fearless chastisement of the factious demagogues, who "bawled for freedom in their senseless mood;" his contempt of the useless and frivolous disputes of the sophists; while we admire his wit and versatility, the vigour and playfulness of his fancy, and the magic harmony of his verse;—our objections to him as a writer who is to be brought into familiar contact with the English reader, remain unimpaired. We trust, moreover, that he will be still banished from the seats of instruction, and not contribute to swell the list of writers, who, besetting the youthful mind in the very vestibules of learning, threaten to extinguish that ingenuous shame, which is its best security and most becoming ornament. The love of paradox or the zeal of editorship may palliate his impurities. But it is not a little water that clears him of his deeds. The stain is more than skin deep. It pervades and poisons the whole mass.

Observing as we do the present translator's idolatrous admiration of his original, we are glad however to perceive, that he has not followed the example of almost all the commentators, editors, and translators of Aristophanes from the invention of printing to the present period, in resting a large portion of the fame of the comic poet upon the patronage of St. Chrysostom. That eminent father of the church (so ran the fable) never retired to rest without placing a copy of him upon his pillow. From Aldus, down to Brunck, every editor transmitted the traditionary falsehood. All the translators, Fielding, Madame Dacier, Dunster, and Cumberland, kept it alive. It staggered and perplexed the pious, that such a sympathy should have existed between the accomplished divine and the licentious poet. For had conjecture been permitted to sketch the retired studies of a saint, it would have placed upon his couch a book inspiring far different contemplations. But while it lived, the imposture had its effect. It furnished Voltaire with a sneer, and gave no slight scandal to those, who had been taught an

habitual reverence for the early lights of the church. Many of the ancient fathers, it is true, were deeply acquainted with heathen literature. It was the armoury whence they drew the keen and polished weapons with which they assailed and overthrew their pagan adversaries. But the love-sick admiration of St. Chrysostom for an obscene writer, was a perplexing paradox, till the lie which was impudently coined by Aldus Minutius, and appeared for the first time in his preface to the first edition of the poet, was detected by the sagacity of Menage.

In dwelling thus upon the impurities of Aristophanes, we might be chargeable with a want of candour and of charity, if we did not give due weight to the extenuations which the state of society and of manners in his time suggests in his behalf. A great reformation of social life was the necessary consequence of a purer theology. Amongst the benignant influences of that religion, which worked so complete a revolution, not only in states and empires, but in the hidden recesses of the human heart, its social and humanizing power has been powerfully operative. When the soul was cleansed of its defilements, licentiousness of phrase disappeared also. The moral darkness of the heathen world will therefore serve generally to account for the abominations that deformed their drama. But, besides the absence of that light, which had not then put to flight the embodied hosts of pagan errors, let it be remembered, that the gentle domination which the fairer half of the species has since acquired over the manners and opinions of the modern world was then wholly unknown. It was not our Jeremy Collier who exiled from the stage the obscenities of Vanburgh and Wycherly. It was the respect which even in a licentious age was never withheld from that part of the sex, who had learned to respect themselves. But the Athenian ladies lived in a state of seclusion from public life. They only occasionally peeped beyond the precincts of domestic retirement at a sacrifice, or mingled in a religious procession. The valuable treatise left us by Xenophon upon domestic oeconomy tells us that their education was scarcely superior to that of their slaves. An highly accomplished order of females, indeed, had access to the theatre; but their reproofs would have been ineffectual, for they wanted the dignity of virtue. The sex as it now exists was unknown in Athens. Minds cultivated into an equality, but never aspiring to rivalry with those, whom Providence has assigned for their protectors, moving in an humbler, but not a lower sphere of duties; living in a little world of sentiment and emotions, from which men are excluded by more rugged and severe occupa-

tions; submissive in their influence, tender in their reproaches, and lighting up in domestic life the chaste and hallowed light of an undissembled affection, or of an ardent passion gradually subsiding into a meek and consecrated friendship—woman so enthroned, so elevated, had not even a poetical existence in an Athenian fancy.

But with these extenuations of his grossness in which we willingly acquiesce, Aristophanes has other charges to answer. For there is a quarrel of some standing between the admirers of Attic wit, and those with whom the names of Socrates and virtue are habitually associated. And after this dispute is adjusted, the scholar, the lover of moral wisdom, the admirer of tenderness and pathos, in short, the student of Euripides, will prefer his complaint on the score of his unceasing hostility to that great master of the Greek drama. Mr. Mitchell deserts his poet in neither of these conflicts. It seems that Aristophanes is to be saved harmless, no matter at whose expense. If Socrates or Euripides stand in the way of his full and perfect commendation, his new admirers address themselves to the pious office of detracting from the reputation of both.

Much as it is to be lamented, that Socrates and Aristophanes should have come into so rude a collision, the subject involves a speculation of more moment, than often pertains to the persons and things of two thousand years ago. It is fitting, that we should feel some solicitude for the characters of the great masters of ancient morality, and that the frequent discrepancy between doctrine and practice should not be exhibited in their examples. We are disposed to admit that the accusation has, by many writers, been pushed too far against Aristophanes. Of any participation in the death of the Athenian sage, he is guiltless. *Ælian's* story, which introduces Melitus as persecuting Socrates in consequence of the representation of the *Clouds*, has been abundantly discredited. Twenty-four years intervened between the play and the condemnation. Still the character of Aristophanes has descended with heavy reproaches for defamation and buffoonery against the purest integrity and the most unclouded wisdom of the heathen world. Is this sentence, in which the whole voice of antiquity concurred, to be reversed? Of the patrons of Aristophanes who have defended him from these imputations, Mr. Cumberland is the Coryphæus. William Schlegel has slightly touched the subject, but his leaning is towards the poet. The former of these learned critics has more decidedly assumed his defence; and Mr. Mitchell, following their footsteps, has entered into a still more expanded view of the question in the Preliminary Discourse prefixed to the volume before

us, and which some of our readers will probably remember in a contemporary journal* of somewhat recent date.

Now the utmost vindication that has been heretofore set up by scholars for the author of the *Clouds* may be thus stated. Socrates, they contended, is not so much the object of ridicule in the play, as the philosophers in general, and the sophists in particular, who by their idle lives, and their minute and sometimes impious disputes, were the authors of much mischief to their disciples and their country. But Mr. Cumberland† was impatient of these limitations. Socrates comes from the hand of that critic more lacerated, than from the lash of the poet. "The *Clouds*," says Cumberland, was written to show how the sophistry of the schools may be employed as an instrument of fraud and evasion in matters of right and morality. It incidentally satirizes chimerical paradoxes concerning the duties of children and of parents. For this purpose a school is introduced, and Socrates at the head of it. It was not a satire upon Socrates, but was intended to raise a harmless laugh at the sophists. Yet, with an improvidence not often found amongst persons habituated to exact reasoning, this mild position is instantly abandoned. For he immediately proceeds to justify the comedy as a direct attack upon Socrates; drags forward against the philosopher all the common-place imputations that have assailed him, and particularly dwells (as a commentary on the Socratic school) upon the infamous lives of its principal disciples. We are reminded of Alcibiades and Æschines, an unprincipled character, says Cumberland, who had learned the art of evading his debts from his master, and whom he supposes (an idea which has escaped the keener glance and sounder erudition of the scholiast) to have been shadowed by Aristophanes under the name of Strepsiades; of Simon so rapacious, that to use the phrase of the poet, the very wolves ran off, as they espied him; of the despicable Cleonymus; of Aristippus, a parasite and drunkard;—and all these as the familiar friends of Socrates. Nor is insinuation spared, to affect him with a shocking and nameless depravity.

To these criminations our answer shall be short. A writer who digs in the filth of Athenæus, and drags before the judicature of a learned and polite age the obscure and doubtful authority of Herodicus, is not entitled to a lengthened refutation. Passing by the evidence of Plato and Xenophon, as delivering their testimonies under the influence of private affection, we have unerring attestations to redeem Socrates from the charge. We have the silence of his enemies. A host of according voices

* Quarterly Review.

† Observer, No. 44.

could not speak more loudly in his favour. Aristophanes,* who brought him upon the stage, and who was by no means disposed to be merciful towards the effeminate vices of his age, is upon this head wholly silent. Melitus his public accuser, who would have gladly strengthened his case by a more substantial accusation, was silent also. Aristoxenus, and several professed enemies of the academy, who hunted out with incredible zeal and untired industry topics of crimination against its illustrious founder, have not said a word on the subject. Add to these negative proofs affirmative evidence not feeble in its authority, the praises heaped upon Socrates by writers who, living so much nearer the Socratic age, could refer to monuments and traditions no longer extant. The very suspicion is inconsistent with the homage paid to his character by the great masters of ancient morality. We can scarcely open a philosophical treatise of Cicero without perusing the panegyric of Socrates in language usually appropriated to superior natures. A Roman poet, whose iron scourge fell with peculiar weight on the filthy voluptuaries of his day, and whose indignation and fury were unchained against the disgraceful vices of humanity, holds up the sage of Athens with an admiration softened by affection, as the pattern of moral purity and virtue.

————— *dulcique senex vicinus Hymetto,*
Qui partem acceptæ sæva inter vincla cicutaë
Accusatori nollet dare.

But we are half ashamed to have dwelt so long upon a question which we considered to have been long settled to the honour of Socrates. Mr. Cumberland's assertions should not have induced us to disturb it. But we think that it is insinuated by Mr. Mitchell in language not less injurious to the memory of the ancient philosopher, because it is somewhat more guarded and ambiguous.

Is the *Clouds* a harmless satire upon the sophists, and therefore absolved from the reproach which has adhered to it for ages, of being a malignant libel upon Socrates? Fredric Schlegel in a tone of modest conjecture and cautious criticism, inclines strongly to the poet. "It is," says he, "another grievous reproach against Aristophanes, that he has represented in such odious colours the wisest and most virtuous of his fellow citizens. It is, however, by no means improbable, that Aristophanes selected without any bad intention that first and best of men, that he might render the sophists as ridiculous as they deserved to be. It is not unlikely, that the poet con-

founded, without wishing it, this inestimable sage with his enemies the sophists, whose schools he frequented in his maturer years, solely with the view to make himself master of that which he meant to refute and overthrow." * To these reasonings, if they deserve the name, we must oppose the simple suggestions of common sense and reason. If it was the exclusive object of the poet to expose the sophists, were the name and person of Socrates requisite to give effect to the satire? Was there no other type under which the sophists could have been ridiculed? The answer is obvious. Not only was there no identity between Socrates and the sophists, but the former had declared inexorable war against them. He reserved for them his richest wit, his severest irony. They were perpetually writhing beneath his hands. Fact also comes in aid of common sense. Whether the defence of Socrates bequeathed to us by Plato, was in substance adopted by his master, is a needless inquiry. Plato, after the condemnation of the sage, published it as the defence of Socrates; and supposing that Plato was the sole author of it, it is not to be supposed that he would have put into the mouth of Socrates a retrospective allusion to the enmity of Aristophanes in the *Clouds*, if such had not been his own conviction or that of his master. Nor were either of them so wanting in natural sagacity as to mistake the harmless burlesque of a noxious sect, for the personal defamnation of Socrates. Let us, however, hear what Socrates in that apology is made to say, when he alludes to his enemies.

"One amongst them," he says, "is a comedian. But what did they object to me? Socrates, they said, is a dangerous man. He is perpetually occupied in inquiries concerning matters, which nature conceals from us. He dresses false reasoning in the garb of truth, and teaches the same pernicious art to others. And this you yourselves saw, when the comedy of Aristophanes was represented, in which a person named Socrates was suspended in a basket, who pretended to walk the air, and many other absurdities. (αλλήν πολλὸν φλυαρίων φλυαρήντα.)" †

The fact speaks unanswerably for itself. Nothing can be more remote from the real Socrates than the Socrates of the *Clouds*. But is the falsehood of the satire to be received as a justification of it? The pernicious maxims put into his mouth, and that of his scholars, are not those of Socrates. Granted. But by what process of reasoning is a plea which admits the falsity of the libel to absolve the author? Its falsehood might have counteracted its malice; but how does it mitigate its guilt? The truth is, that it is a gross caricature, though

* Lectures on the History of Lit. p. 57.

† Plato in *Apol.* Ed. Bipont.

not founded on the faintest resemblance. The dramatic Socrates is in most direct contrast to the philosopher. In the play he is represented as a stipendiary teacher. He received no salary or pay for his instructions. The young man in the play beats his father across the stage as a corollary from the precepts of Socrates. No moralist ever urged more forcibly upon children their duties to their parents. There is in the excellent work of Xenophon* an admirable exhortation to filial piety which Socrates gave his eldest son, who had complained to him of the violent temper of his mother Xantippe. The slow process of induction peculiar to the Socratic discourse renders it less energetic, than it might have been, had it appeared in a shape less formal and didactic. But even as a specimen of the peculiar manner of the philosopher, it is not without its value. Having by the usual machinery of interrogation obtained the youth's acquiescence in a series of propositions, by which ingratitude was reduced to a species of injustice, which became aggravated in a ratio to the value and amount of the benefits received, he asks, whether any higher benefits can be received than those which children receive from their parents? He then sums them up; the hour of maternal anguish; the anxious and sleepless cares of the mother for her progeny; the nurture supplied from the fountains of her own existence; the solitudes with which she hangs over the cradle of her unconscious infant; the trembling anxieties, with which she conducts him through the perils of his tender years, with no other recompense than the satisfactions of a mother's heart. This is an imperfect summary of a beautiful passage, which must be dear to every feeling mind. It will be sufficient, however, to furnish a convincing contrast between the malice of Aristophanes, and the purity which he endeavoured to defame.

These remarks have been extorted from us by the new sect of literature, of which the principal aim is to raise Aristophanes upon the ruins of a better man. Of these, we think, that the translator of the two plays before us is not among the most candid or moderate. Borrowing the celebrated hint of Procrustes, he seems determined to fit Socrates to his bed of torture, and to adapt him in all respects to the *Clouds* of Aristophanes. In confirmation of this remark, we select the following passage from his Preliminary Discourse, the positions of which are apparently confirmed by copious citations from Plato and Xenophon, although Mr. Mitchell's uncompressed habits of diction render the quotation almost inconsistent with the limits prescribed to us.

“ About the time when the play called the *Clouds* was brought before a public audience, a person was seen in all the streets and public places of Athens, whose appearance, manners, and doctrines equally tended to excite observation. If not a sophist himself, he was at least seen continually in the company of the sophists; and, as he made no scruple to practise upon them the arts which they practised upon others, it is no wonder that an almost general opinion should have considered him as one of the profession; as a sophist more honest indeed than the rest, but in talent, in vanity, and self-conceit surpassing them all. Like the sophists and philosophers, he had given himself deeply and unmeritedly to physical researches: and in a temperament naturally melancholy, it had produced such an effect upon his countenance and manners, that by the gayer part of his fellow-citizens, who wanted opportunities of knowing him more intimately, an introduction to his society was considered as something like venturing into the sombre cavern of Trophonius. And certainly there were not wanting reasons for forming such an opinion. Wrapt up in profound reveries, the ordinary functions of nature seemed sometimes suspended in him—the vicissitudes of day and night passed unobserved, the necessary refectious of rest and food were neglected, and he seemed to have derived from his own experience the reproach which he sometimes cast upon the other philosophers, that their native town had only possession of their bodies, but that the air was the chosen habitation of their minds. The pride of knowledge communicated a consequence which contrasted rather ridiculously with the humility of his external appearance; his air was stern, his step was lofty, and his eyes, if not fixed upon the heavens, were thrown around with an appearance of conscious importance. He was rather ostentatious in proclaiming that his father had been a statuary, his mother a midwife; and he explained, in language highly ingenious, but rather more at length, perhaps, than was consistent with good taste, and certainly in terms which only a degraded state of female estimation would allow to be called decent, that the profession, which his mother had practised, was that which he also pursued; with this difference, that he performed for the intellect, what she had done for the body; and that while she confined her attentions to the female sex, his obstetric services had been devoted exclusively to the male. * * * By whatever name, however, he chose to term his vocation, certain it was, that no man could be more assiduous in the prosecution of it. Whoever was the disputant, or whatever the subject of conversation, the discourse finally fell upon the head of the person with whom he was conversing. Armed with a divine commission, as he pretended, for that purpose, and himself under the immediate direction of a supernatural being, not perfectly naturalized in the theology of his country, every man was questioned by him in turn, and found no respite, till he gave a complete account of himself:—what was his present and what had been his past mode of life,—and once upon this topic, said one who knew him well, there is no hope of escape, till you have been put to the touchstone torture, and your whole life sifted to the bottom. So strong was this passion, that the attachment to rural scenes, which prevailed so

strongly in most of his fellow-citizens, in him seemed a feeling almost extinct—he was a stranger to the environs of Athens, and was scarcely ever seen outside the walls. * * * * Man was his game; and from man he never wished to be absent; but the passion was by no means reciprocal: a catechist so inquisitorial was not always agreeable, and the presence of the philosopher either created a solitude where he went, or if he collected an audience, it was among the idle young men, who took a malicious pleasure in his cutting remarks, and who immediately left him to practise upon others the lessons which they had just received. In a town where the personal appearance of the male sex excited more comments and observation than the female, even the exterior of this person was calculated to fix the attention of many, who were not disposed to penetrate beyond it; and whatever merriment was excited on this subject, it must be owned that himself was ever the first to set the joke afloat. His eyes (to use the words in which he was accustomed to draw his own figure, and in which it will be necessary to follow him, for purposes that will appear hereafter) stood so forward in his head, that they enabled him not only to see straight before him, but even to look sideways; and he used in consequence to boast, that himself and a crab were, of all other animals, the two best adapted for vision. * * * * With a view to reduce the periphery of his body, which certainly was not very exact in its proportions, he practised dancing, and that down to a very advanced period of life; not merely to the occasional discomfiture of serious reflection in his pupils, but even to the excitement of a doubt in them, whether their master was quite correct in his senses:—to close this, not very agreeable part of the subject:—when these pupils likened his whole exterior to that of the Sileni, no doubt of the truth was ever expressed, and no umbrage taken as at a supposed affront. Though little distinguished for beauty himself, some of the handsomest young men of Athens were seen continually in his train: and while they did not scruple to take the utmost liberty in expressing their opinion upon his deformity, he did not perhaps altogether find his advantage in gazing upon their beauty; for it led to the objection, which the warmest of his admirers either did not attempt to deny, or found it necessary to palliate, that it led him sometimes to clothe the noblest operations and aspirations of the mind in the language of the senses, that it engaged him to arrive at mental through corporal excellence, and made it appear, that the presence of the beautiful Agathon, or the interesting Autolycus was necessary, before the philosopher could arrive at the essential beauty, the *αὐτὸ καὶ αὐτὸ*, his reveries about which must have become sometimes a little fatiguing to the most admiring of his auditors. With these persons, who were never many in number, of whom the more ambitious deserted their master as soon as they had gained the object which brought them into his society, and others of whom left him to form schools, whose names have since been synonymous with sophistry, the coarsest effrontery, and the most undisguised voluptuousness, the greatest part of his time was spent; for the civil duties which occupied the hours of others were avocations which he chose wholly to decline: he never made part of the General Assem-

bly; he never frequented the Courts of Law; and the awkward manner in which he performed the externals of a senator, when necessity or accident brought him into the situation, shewed that neither practice nor reflexion had made him acquainted with the duties of the office. Even that duty which seemed peculiarly connected with his office of a public teacher, that of committing to writing the result of his studies, or giving a lasting habitation to those important disputations in which he was continually engaged, was a task which he declined, and for which he had framed reasons, which, however satisfactory to himself, have by no means been equally so to those who have lived after him. To himself, however, one very satisfactory consequence resulted from these derelictions, as some did not hesitate to call them, of the duties of a citizen: it left him the most unlimited leisure for frequenting, what seemed his peculiar delight, the schools of the sophists, and engaging in disputation with those fallacious pretenders to universal knowledge. If there were some points in which the sophists and himself had a certain similarity, there were many of a trifling, and still more of a serious nature, in which they were diametrically opposite. While the sophists went clad in magnificent garments, he appeared in the most plain and simple apparel. The same coat served him for winter and summer, and he preserved the old-fashioned manner of his country in going always barefooted: he frequented the baths but rarely, and never indulged in the usual luxury of perfumes. While the sophists confined themselves to the sons of the wealthy and the great, and were therefore known to them and them only, he did not disdain to frequent the meanest of the artisans, to converse with them in their own language, and on topics with which they were most familiar. There was even a class in society still more degraded, which he did not scruple occasionally to visit, and to evince, by his instructions, that there was no class of society whose pursuits had wholly escaped his scrutinising eye. The effect of these visits was very evident in his language, and those who felt themselves annoyed by his raillery, or pressed by his acuteness, did not fail to throw into his face the shipwrights, the cobblers, the carpenters and weavers, with whom his habits of intercourse were not unfrequent, and from whom he was so fond of drawing those maxims and comparisons, which confounded the class of persons, to whose annoyance and discomfiture he seems to have devoted the greatest portion of his time. It is the language of the chivalrous ages, which would best do justice to this part of his character: and the knight, locked up in complete armour, and ready to run a-tilt with the first person he met, is the completest image of this philosopher, preparing to encounter the sophists, at once apparently his enemies and his rivals.

“To ask questions or to answer them—to convict or to be convicted—were, in his own words, the great purposes for which men should meet together; and a person, who had decreed that his life should be a complete logomachy, could not have come to the contest better prepared; nor, where words were to be the weapons of warfare, could any man draw them from a better-provided armory. * * * * His hear-

ers described the effects of witchery and enchantment: they compared it to the touch of the torpedo, which causes a numbness in the faculties. Much was affirmed by him, and little proved—both sides of a question were alternately taken, and the result left upon his hearers' mind was, that he himself was in doubt, and only excited doubts in others. The sophists, indeed, by the manner in which they were handled, were made, *especially in hot weather*, to perspire more copiously than, perhaps, was agreeable; for their subtleties were met with niceties still more acute than their own, and they were entrapped into admissions of which they did not foresee the consequence; but their falsehoods were also combated with positions which he who advanced them would have been unwilling to have had considered as decidedly his own, and in pursuing them into their dark recesses his own gigantic powers could not altogether save him from the reproach which he cast upon another: "the best divers only should venture to plunge into a "sea of such prodigious depth." Such was the person whom Aristophanes selected to be the hero of his *Clouds*." (P. xc—ci.)

Nor is this all. There is a mass of insinuation contained in another passage. Having observed that the character of Socrates was a little more open to remark than some admirers in their ignorance were aware of, and more than some in their knowledge were willing to bring into notice, "Learned and impartial men," says Mr. Mitchell, "well acquainted with the subject, will do the present writer the justice to say, that *some points* are not pressed so closely as they might have been, and that had he not confined himself to the two authors, (Xenophon and Plato) from whom he has very rarely deviated, his remarks might have been conveyed in a higher tone of censure." *

Our readers will peruse with various impressions the portraiture thus drawn of Socrates. The general effect, however, is an unfavourable one, and the prevailing sensation which it is calculated to excite must be that of disgust for a character formed of features so harsh and disagreeable. They ought to be reminded, however, that it is not a portrait of the sage systematically taken, of which the lineaments, blended into each other, constitute a whole by means of mutual softenings and mingled traits, nor so exhibited as to be contemplated at one view, but patched together from widely detached and unconnected passages torn from their context, and selected for the support of a peculiar hypothesis. We will not revive the insinuation thrown out by Athenæus † on Plato's authenticity as a writer of narrative. Yet certain it is that a dramatic or fictitious character prevails through those beautiful dialogues; that in those writings he seems more intent upon striking effect, than

studious of faithful delineation, and that after all they do not furnish us with a clear and uniform account either of the ethics or the life of Socrates. Be that as it may, some research has enabled us to say with confidence that these features of Socrates, so collected from Plato and Xenophon, have received considerable heightenings from the pencil of Mr. Mitchell. For instance, Socrates is said to have been deeply and unremittingly given to physical researches, which produced such an effect on his countenance and manners, that those who frequented his disputations returned from them as from the cave of Trophonius. Now in the *Phædon* (the passage to which Mr. Mitchell refers his readers) Socrates merely admits, that *in his youth* (*ἡλικίᾳ αὐτῷ*) he had addicted himself to these inquiries. This, according to our author, is sufficient to class him with the sophists. But what does it amount to? He passed through the elementary course of Athenian studies. Is this circumstance to fix upon him a predilection for those vain and frivolous inquiries, which none derided more keenly, or exposed more skilfully? Every scholar must have remarked the contempt which he expressed for those studies at a maturer period. None can forget that it was Socrates who effected the great revolution in moral science, which, to use the words of the eloquent disciple of the second academy,* brought philosophy down from her ærial abodes to converse with man, introduced her into the commonwealth, placed her in private life, and exercised her in investigations adapted to the affairs of the world, and the end and dignity of our being; and were we desirous of opposing Plato to Plato, we might observe, that, in the *Apology*, Socrates expressly denies that he was ever addicted to these studies at all. As to the cave of Trophonius, it is Aristophanes in the *Clouds* who supplies the image to Mr. Mitchell. But Aristophanes is a party in the suit, and his evidence must go for nothing.

In the *Memorabilia* of Xenophon,† Socrates discourses specifically upon the inanity of physical science, with only a parenthetical admission of not being wholly ignorant of it. When the reader has attentively read this passage, which, be it observed, is one of the authorities cited by Mr. Mitchell to show that Socrates was addicted to the frivolous study which he there so strongly reprehends, he will rise from its perusal completely satisfied that the fondness of the Athenian philosopher for physical pursuits was by no means fair game for Aristophanes, and that it is an imputation equally false and unfounded.

* Tusc. Quæst. p. 14. Acad. Quæst. lib. i. + Xen. Mem. lib. iv. c. 7.

That he was frequently seen among the sophists is pretty evident, for he was engaged in endless disputes with those intellectual jugglers. He gave them no quarter. He left no occasion unimproved of showing the spuriousness of their wisdom, and the fallacy of their doctrines. He strangled the most powerful and gigantic of these logomachists, Protagoras,* who in the beginning of the controversy, as it is delineated by Plato, appears to have had the advantage, and received the applause of the company. A few short interrogatories however (the *experimentum crucis* of the Socratic logic) decided the conflict. We can readily suppose indeed that the perpetual use of this weapon must have been highly tormenting; to those small wits in particular whom Socrates encountered, and who, by the dexterous application of it, were not only made to admit, but themselves to detect their own absurdities. According to Mr. Mitchell, it was an intolerable persecution let loose upon society; and as every man was obliged to undergo a minute questioning, till his whole life had been sifted to the bottom, it must have produced, as he affirms on the authority of Xenophon, a solitude around the tormenting inquisitor. We were diffident of the fact, and our own recollections not concurring with the sense which Mr. Mitchell seems to attribute to the passage which has furnished him with the picture of this intolerable inquisition, we again betook ourselves to the text of Plato. True it is, that in the dialogue intitled Laches, Nicias tells Lysimachus, that he who disputed with Socrates, whatever might be the subject of discourse, was so hooked in as to be obliged perforce to give an account of himself and the whole system of his life, and that there was no chance of escape till the whole examination was completed. We are ready to admit that this must have been vexatious enough. Let us, however, pursue the passage to its context, and see whether something does not turn up for Socrates. The description given by Nicias of the Socratic disputation is, no doubt, heightened for the dramatic effect which Plato had in view. But hear how the same person in the dialogue softens this severe scrutiny into one of the best exercises of the mind, that of a close and rigid self-examination. "For my part," continues Nicias, "I am quite broken in to this discipline. I am far from thinking that it has an injurious tendency to be thus called upon to revive the recollections of the good and evil we have done. He who undergoes such an inquisition must necessarily act more providently for the future."† We turned also to the passage in Xenophon for the

* Plat. in Prot. p. 232.

† Plato in Lachel. p. 179. Ed. Bipont.

solitude which this mode of disputation brought round the philosopher. The whole chapter exhibits a lively specimen of the Socratic mode of argument. Euthydoneus, a young man of high promise, fresh from the schools of the sophists, to an overweening confidence in his own powers, and a supreme contempt for the ordinary modes of acquiring knowledge, added a dangerous aspiration after the first offices of the republic. He is brought by Socrates to an admission, *that he knew nothing*. He withdrew abashed, but returned amended, attended Socrates with unremitting assiduity, and diligently modelled himself after his precepts. Many of those, says Xenophon, who were thus handled came to him no more; but they were those whom Socrates considered to be weak and senseless.* Such is the solitude created around him; or such rather the disproportionate generality of Mr. Mitford's deduction from premises so narrowly limited. What could be more in the ordinary course of things than that the idle and the vain should fly from a discipline which, however salutary, tormented their vanity, or that the ingenuous and docile, on the other hand, should adhere to him with a grateful sense of the good effects which they had derived from the moral medicine which he administered to the little and mean passions of their nature?

It is not indeed to be dissembled that, as a process for the discovery or elucidation of truth, the Socratic argumentation is tedious and circuitous. By assuming that the adversary disputes every step of the argument, the disputation is drawn out to an unprofitable minuteness, and the reasoner, instead of setting out upon some intelligible axiom, or some undeniable assumption, has to extort an assent to that which is nearly self-evident, before he can advance a single step. The logical experiment of Squire Thornhill upon poor Moses in the Vicar of Wakefield is an admirable burlesque of the Socratic argument. But the medicine is to be estimated by the constitution and habit on which it had to work. In this point of view it was an admirable machinery for turning the sophisms of the pretended philosophy of the day against those who dealt in them.

Enough, we presume, has been said to shew that Socrates is not amenable to the ridicule or the reproach so justly incurred by the sophists. But we have to parry a two-edged sword. With great industry, all the supposed deformities of the Athenian philosopher are put together, dove-tailed and tessellated so as to quadrate with the Socrates of the Clouds. Yet with the absurdest inconsistency we are called on to relish the wit of

the Clouds, and to preserve our respect for Socrates, because it is said the satire is exclusively pointed at the sophists. *Tantumne rem tam negligenter?* Why then expend so much learned industry to place Socrates amongst the sophists; nay, to make him the most contemptible and disgusting of the sophists? He must be an Œdipus, not a Davila who can follow Mr. Mitchell through the windings and doublings of his argument. The Clouds was not written to expose Socrates, but Socrates was selected to give more effect to the Clouds, says the dissertator (p. 137.) It should seem that Socrates was scarcely aimed at by the comic poet. We proceed a page or two onwards, (139) and the same dissertator assures us that the chastisement dealt him in the play had the effect of directing his mind to better pursuits.

We are aware, that we have not noticed half the insinuations urged against one of the greatest men in the ancient world. We have, however, not dealt in conjecture. We followed Mr. Mitchell to his authorities, because we were diffident of the extent of inference which he has uniformly drawn from them. The scepticism, of which Euripides has described the advantages in matters of graver import, we called to our aid in the lighter, but by no means unimportant, task of redeeming Socrates from unjust calumny and unmerited reproach, and we felt

Σωφρονος γὰρ ἀπιστίας
Ὡς ἄδεν χρησιμώτερον βροῦτοις.

We are conscious also that much more remains for animadversion. The insinuations against Socrates are not yet exhausted. As to the familiar divinity, the best and most enlightened judges of antiquity have interpreted it into an internal impulse, which restrained,* without impelling his actions. Figuratively called a divine voice or demon, it was nothing more than that internal movement, the fruit of diligent observation and a minute attention to the moral connexions so nicely linked by the great author of the universe, which gave him an almost immediate intimation of those things from which it was his duty to abstain. It was experience ripened "into a prophetic strain." In one word, it was that conscience, which in the absence of a better light, for which the world was not ripe, by a process as quick as intuition, resisted the solicitings of passion, and showed at once the moral complexion and tendencies of the act, which it warned him to avoid.† In the bill of indictment drawn up by Mr. Mitchell, the intercourses in which he lived with the

* Cic. de Divin.

† See Apuleius de Deo Socr.

artizans of Athens have also a conspicuous place assigned to them. We again refer our readers to the passage in Xenophon* from which the reproach has been drawn. Candid minds, however, with the example of an infinitely superior nature before them, will not visit the Athenian teacher with much severity, when they follow him to the dwelling of Parahsius the painter, or of Clito the statuary, or of Pistias the armourer; and view him condescending in language fitted to their capacities, and by illustrations drawn from their arts, to instruct them in the good and the fair, and the congruity and fitness of the moral perfections.

Let it not be supposed that we are willing to bestow idolatrous praise on Socrates. It were an injury and injustice to the brightest of Pagan characters to try him by the standard of Christian perfection: but let us not be frugal of our admiration, when we recollect that his self-denial and temperance and fortitude were nurtured in the sterile soil of heathen morality. The decree, which unbarred the gates of immortality and life was yet shrouded in the dark destinations of infinite wisdom. But the knowledge of the one true and living God, and the glimmering belief of future dispensations, had broken out in a feeble ray over the darkness of the ancient world. Passages of frequent recurrence in the works of Plato show that both the master and the disciple had ascended as far as unassisted reason could lead them, towards those elevated speculations. In the *Phædrus*, philosophy seems to have soared to the great author of the good and the fair, and to have deduced by a series of plain and intelligible inductions irresistible proofs of the indestructibility and future existence of the soul. Yet whilst we make these concessions, we must be timidly cautious, lest the youthful mind should imbibe the pernicious error that, before the great doctrines of repentance and atonement, which lead us at once to our proper good by holy and infallible promises and denunciations, and substitute the gladdening assurances of the gospel for the hope skirted with fear, and the dim and doubtful light of natural reason,—before the dawn of that bright day, even Socrates himself had attained more than “the beggarly elements,” the form and phantasm of that true and perfect wisdom which cometh from above.

If we have lingered thus long upon the character of Socrates, and Aristophanes is again brought to trial for “*The Clouds*,” the fault is theirs, who have disturbed the verdict long since pronounced by the enlightened voice of antiquity, and a host of scholars, from the revival of letters to the present day:

But if any argument were wanting to shew how inappropriate to Socrates was the buffoonery of the Clouds; the piece was unsuccessful, although the poet had enriched it with all the varied fruits of genius and fancy. Had Warburton not listened to Ælian, who attributed to the acting of it the criminal condemnation of Socrates, he would not, in his masterly dedication of the "Divine Legation," have adduced its success as an instance of the pernicious use of ridicule, and the triumph of buffoonery over virtue. We are plain men, and can easily conceive, that even to the Athenian people a caricature without a resemblance, a satire without verisimilitude, would be a matter of distaste and aversion. The chivalry of Mr. Mitchell however does not permit him to attribute the failure of the poet to its most natural cause. He admits indeed that Aristophanes, who was nicely skilled in the preparation of what was palatable to his audience, who had long studied their tastes, and successfully administered both to their eyes and ears all that the pomp of decoration, and all that the harmonies of verse and music could contribute to the fascination of each, had, on this occasion, rather surpassed than fallen short of his usual efforts. But the subject of the play was not interesting: (what more interesting to an Attic audience, we are tempted to ask, than personal satire?) it had no connexion with the Dionysian festivities; the wrong festival was chosen, the greater instead of the lesser; in one word, Aristophanes, to whom in all that pertains to the *ordonnance*, the *getting up* in our theatric idiom of a play, he attributes so much ingenuity and diligence, who had at stake also the highest rewards to which Athenian genius could aspire, or by which Athenian vanity could be soothed, the crown of dramatic victory;—Aristophanes, by the most drivelling inattention to these circumstances, wrecked his play and his reputation.

Having said so much of Socrates, we must not overlook Euripides, who has also experienced some rough handling from the comic poet. In vindication of Aristophanes, his translator has recourse to M. Schlegel, who has brought the poor tragedian to trial for a long series of offences against taste and morals. Now, we have long considered M. Schlegel to be a sound and judicious critic, and the opinions of such a man we are inclined to treat with the highest respect. But at the same time, we cannot pronounce him to be uninfected with the vices of the German philosophy; whilst we think too that the peculiarities of that school of thinking furnish a tolerably clear ~~plu-
sion~~ for the paradoxical judgment which he has passed on Euripides. For who does not know, that of that school the ~~ling~~ affectation is that of exploring the inmost recesses of the mind and the heart for the principles of our knowledge and

the sentiments of our nature? Each critic in right of his "interior researches" sets up an independent rule of judgment. Hence it is that, as Madame de Stael observes, they have no fixed standard of taste. Lessing, Goethe, and Schiller had before their eyes a vibratory and uncertain criterion of excellence, and were therefore perpetually changing the form and model of their dramas. One of the prerogatives which is assumed by almost every critic of that country is a perfect independence of all former codes or canons. Hence it is that they overlook the only real standard of critical investigation, that practicable excellence which is alone permitted to the intellect of man, and which consists in a mixed but harmonious assemblage of faults and beauties, of graces and defects, in pursuit of the shadowy forms of an ideal perfection. In such a relaxation from all precedent or rule, it may be easily supposed, that the tone of criticism becomes exaggerated; that every thing is stated in the extreme, and scarcely any proposition laid down that is sufficiently mixed or qualified.

Whilst we attribute, however, M. Schlegel's animadversions on Euripides to the love of paradox, incident, for the reasons just stated, to the critical school of the Germans, we are not on the other hand insensible to the force of certain objections, which have been legitimately urged against the poet, and for some of which he has been judiciously reprehended by the old scholiast. True it is, that he deals most profusely in maxims (*γνῶμαι*), that his dialogue abounds with too quick reciprocations, that his loquacity (*λαλία*) occasionally retards the action of his pieces, that his rhetoric has some flavour of the schools, and that his prologues torment us now and then with the most tedious genealogies. But the imputation of a relaxed morality seems to us the very fever of exaggerated criticism. And how is the imputation supported? It seems that this great master of pathos and feeling has sometimes put into the mouths of his persons ambiguous and casuistic maxims; for instance, "the mouth has sworn, but the heart disavows the oath," which has been so severely ridiculed by Aristophanes. But are dramatic passages fairly dealt by, when they are torn from their context, and the characters by whom they are uttered? Yes, observes M. Schlegel; for their abbreviated and sententious form fixes them on the memory, and renders them more liable to a perverted application. Surely this is "considering the matter too curiously." For how is the argument to end, without involving in the sweeping condemnation of an *Index expurgatorius* the brief and sententious aphorisms of fraud or cunning, ambition or avarice, which occur in almost every page of the dramatists and poets? Thus we have the miser's consoling

doctrine in Horace ready cut and dried for misers in all times and countries. *Populus me sibilat*, &c. &c.; Shakspeare's solace for affrighted ambition, hesitating to wade through slaughter to a throne, "Things bad begun," &c. &c. These little maxims are prepared for pocket use, short, epigrammatic, and easy to be remembered. Yet it would demand more than common gravity to hear them arraigned, as tending to make men misers or murderers.

There are other exceptions urged by Mr. Mitchell against Euripides, both as a poet and a moral writer, which it would lengthen our digression too much to notice. They derive, however, their strength from an ill-timed and forced comparison of the bard with Æschylus and Sophocles, his great precursors. True, he has neither the bold and overbearing sublimity of the one, nor the manly yet delicate graces of the other. For, the whole frame and texture of his dramas bespeak a new stage of the art. It was an experiment that had not till then been tried, to exhibit a closer conformity between the tragic stage and what is really passing in the world, than is to be found in the plays of the poets just alluded to. To this end, it was requisite for him to do that which had not been done before, to consider the almost boundless region of the human passions, the endless conflicts of human purposes, and the diversified sorrows which are scattered around us, as the rightful domain of tragedy. Hence he neither employed the elevated and fanciful personages of Æschylus, nor the pure and faultless characters of Sophocles, for they were instruments that would have impeded his design. His dramatic persons for the same reason, though belonging to what are called the heroic times, speak the language of human beings; they are gladdened by the same joys, bowed down by the same griefs which affect us all. We might do greater justice to Euripides, by enlarging upon the topic; but to those who cannot feel the exquisite pathos of the poet to a degree sufficient to stifle the cavils of so minute a criticism, every appeal would be fruitless. With such understandings, we want a common language to be mutually understood. These, however, are not our own sentiments only: they are confirmed by the suffrage of critics and scholars of the highest authority. As to the morality of his dramas, it may be enough to mention our own Milton, a man of austere morals, versed in all human learning, and familiar with every form and combination of poetic beauty. Milton, it is well known, adopted Euripides into the circle of his literary friendships, and devoted himself with the fondest enthusiasm to a diligent and critical perusal of his text. But we shall take our leave of the topic, by citing the testimony of

a modern critic, who understood Euripides just as well as the German critic, or Cambridge translator, and then return to Aristophanes: .

“Osor formidolosæ superstitionis, quæ cives Atticos agitabat, de uno Deo universi conditore, de providâ divinæ mentis circâ res humanas curâ, de virtutis amore, de certo scelerum vindice, de præmiis piorum sic sensit, ut in istâ terrarum orbis caligine, solus ille poëtarum sapuisse dignusque Socratis consortio fuerit visus Clementi Alexandrino, atque inter paucos proximus accepisse veritatem, quam Christiani profitemur. Veræ virtutis et honesti laudator constantissimus.” *

He who would judge accurately of the old Greek comedy, must keep his eye upon the contemporary state of Athenian manners, and remember that about the time of Pericles, the natural sensibility of the Athenians, fostered by his encouragement, had grown into an ungovernable passion for the theatre. As an agreeable alternation to the noble productions of the tragic Muse, and the severer exercises of the mind by pity and terror, arose the old comedy, which combined all the playfulness of the most sportive buffoonery, with the higher graces of the drama. For the Athenians were sensitively alive to the ridiculous. Their comedy therefore was a luscious and varied banquet for those who were addicted to laughter, and not very nice about what they laughed at: it was a species of amusement, unfettered by the regular laws of the drama; in which the poet, out of a gross and wild improbability, in which real and fictitious persons, wit, and satire, and personal defamation, produced the most unexpected combinations, whirled his audience through a world of his own creation. Athens, it must also be remembered, was the centre of a small but powerful state. The sovereignty was in the hands of the people. Every marked distinction was annihilated. The right of citizenship was rigorously confined to a certain number: hence every species of excellence, that seemed to overtop the democratic equality, when denounced and ridiculed on the stage, administered to the debased appetite for defamation, which, as we have already observed, was a prominent feature of the Athenian character; a passion so omnivorous, that even the sister art of painting largely partook of its spirit.

But besides the causes which we have enumerated as acting powerfully on the Greek comedy, it had other peculiarities. The perplexities which, gradually unravelled, constitute the plots, as they are called, of the modern drama—the embarrassments and rivalships of lovers—the delicate distresses of heroines—all of which are cleared up at the termination;—there was nothing

* Diatribè in Eurip. Valcknaer.

that approached to this in the ancient comedy. Aristophanes cared nothing about his plots: he abounds with what does not in the least conduce to the business of the drama. But Mr. Bayes, no mean authority, has told us that the only use of the plot is to bring in good things. By this test, the comedies of Aristophanes are unexceptionable. His scenes are those of a magic lantern, whose wild and grotesque figures succeed each other in a series irregular but not confused, and with a freedom, that seems to laugh at the pedantic rigour of the unities. There is another distinction: our comedies are drawn, for the most part, from the prevailing humours of certain classes and subdivisions; the frustrated pretences of that ludicrous but common vanity, which measures its demands upon the homage of others by that which it pays to itself, and that other species of it which is incident to certain ranks and distinctions, and arises out of a sort of *esprit de corps*. Nothing of this kind existed at Athens, and therefore furnished no pleasantry for their stage. For the Athenian institutions were uniformly equal; no condition of life was prominent enough to be characterized by its appropriate foibles, or to generate its peculiar humour.

As to the *ordonnance* of the Greek stage, we know but little. The Abbé Barthélemy, in his "Anacharsis," has laboured the subject with much research; but nothing satisfactory is the result of his researches. An apprehension of substituting conjecture for fact restrains us from enlarging on the music and dancing of the Greeks, of which the effects have probably been much exaggerated. We shall only observe, that the absence of those sources of dramatic imitation, which we have just noticed, reduced the dramatic subjects of the old comedy to two; political affairs, and private defamation. The comic chorus, therefore, which generally represented the people, was an important agent. Besides this, the Greek comedies were parodies of their most popular tragedies, and *got up*, with all the pomp and circumstance of the tragic drama. Upon the chorus the comic poet lavished all his skill in rhythm and harmony. Such was the opulence of Aristophanes, that he has chorusses which, for beauty and diction, and sweetness of versification, are not surpassed either by Sophocles or Euripides. The peculiar distinction, however, of the comic chorus is the *Parabasis*; it is this which constitutes the great charm of Aristophanes: for by this invention the Author, in the intervals of the acts, (though strictly speaking, the Greek comedy is not divisible into acts,) himself addressed the audience. He extolled his own merit: if he had been unsuccessful in former contests, he complained of the injustice, not unfrequently of the want of taste of his judges; sometimes he threw out satyric taunts

against his rivals; sometimes arraigned the public measures, or proposed new ones. Such was the anomalous and singular construction of the old comedy, of which we have brought a few peculiarities to the notice of our readers, that they might come in some degree prepared for what must otherwise strike them with surprise, if not with disgust, when they take up the comedies of Aristophanes in their own language.

Enough has been already said, to show that we are sensible of the appalling difficulty of rendering Aristophanes in a living tongue. To Mr. Mitchell we readily concede a familiar acquaintance with the old scholia, and the customs and habits of Athens. We trust also that he is not deficient in the more ordinary requisite of a translator; a critical knowledge of the text, and great industry, aided by natural acuteness in its elucidation. But all these endowments may superlatively fall to the lot of a translator; and after all, Aristophanes remain untranslated. It is no reproach to fail where success is scarcely attainable. The difficulty seems insurmountable in the translation of a comic poet. Of tragedy, the language is universal: its passions and sorrows are of all times and countries, and written in the universal charter of our nature: but folly and affectation, and those moral deformities which belong to the ridiculous—these are not conventional. They are so modified by times and circumstances, and forms of polity and society, that they lose all their vitality when they are transplanted to other times, and placed in different groupes, and surrounded with other circumstances. These are general impediments: others are peculiar to Aristophanes. His beauties are so peculiarly those of a country and dialect, they are in short so truly Attic, enshrined as it were in so rich and exquisite a diction, that all his brightness becomes dim as soon as it is viewed through another medium; and his humour is of so volatile and aerial a quality, that it will for ever elude the grasp of the most accomplished translator. Still it would be pedantry to assert, that every effort to give a tolerable sketch of him in English must be unavailing. The problem is, by what rules and on what principles such a translation should be conducted? Our opinion is, that Mr. Mitchell, with whatever felicity of versification he has executed his task, has followed rules and principles which have led him astray from his original.

Translators are naturally impatient of restraint: but there are certain statutes and regulations, from which they can plead no exemption. As far as it is possible, we have a right to know in English what the author said in Greek. There is however a refuge to which they sometimes betake themselves. They tell us, that if it is not what the author actually said, it is what he would

have said, had he written in English. To this maxim it is to be ascribed, that the Father of Poetry, whose excellencies are vigour of thought and simplicity of expression, has appeared in a translation, where the thought is for the most part overlaid by the diction. But the licence, if rightly exercised by the translator of Homer, ought not to be claimed by him, who undertakes Aristophanes, and for a plain reason, "The solid trunk of sentiment," says Dr. Johnson, "will not be impaired by the freest version:" but as to colloquial and idiomatic expression, and those combinations which we style wit, of these we shall get nothing at all in a translation, which is wholly absolved from its original. What then is required of a translator? Not that he should perplex his readers or himself in a vain attempt to give his author the kind of English, which he supposes that he would have used had he written English: for

" Thus Greece and Rome in modern dress arrayed
Is but antiquity in masquerade."

An English poem is not the legitimate exchange for a Greek original. But we require from translators a species of English, which, without violence to the laws and idioms of our own tongue, interprets, with all possible fidelity, those of the author. That it will, after all, be an unfaithful representation in respect of spirit and character is certain; but this is a necessary condition of translation: a general likeness is all that can be demanded. It is true the English reader will peruse with unmoved muscles, in his own tongue, that which convulsed an Athenian with laughter. What of that? he must bend to necessity. Time and space will not yield to his desires. All that he can rationally expect is an approximation so close as to give him an idea, however faint, of the general character of what was considered to be humour in Athens.

Not that we require a servile interpretation; we contend only against that species of paraphrase which, whilst it is perpetually eddying in circles round the author, never comes near him. We do not quarrel with Mr. Mitchell for adopting the diction which Cumberland employed in his spirited translations of the fragments preserved in Athenæus. The language of Jonson and Fletcher, adopted by that critic, is the genuine and native vigour of our speech, antiquated, but not obsolete. But we hold him highly responsible for not being faithful to the imagery of his original; for this is indispensable in translation, according to the statutes in that case made and provided. How can we form a conception of the qualities of a poet's imagination, but by the figures which he employs? If other metaphors or similes are substituted, we lose the distinctive strokes of the author;

and the translator is disloyal to his original. We think that Mr. Mitchell has egregiously offended in this particular. Nor did Mr. Cumberland, in his excellent translation of "The Clouds," play the metrical tricks exhibited by Mr. Mitchell, in the vain imagination of representing the unimitated and inimitable measures of the comic master in namby-pamby verse, and singing rhyme. Nor did he treat his readers with *centos* from Shakspeare, and other poets familiar to our ears; a practice against which we strongly protest, and for this reason:—we are willing to flatter ourselves that we are reading Aristophanes, when we read the plays translated by Mr. Mitchell; but the illusion vanishes, when we find that Shakspeare and other of our elder poets have supplied any portion of his dialogue. Memory whispers where the translator stole his spoils; and the whole has a clumsy and patch-work appearance. Moreover, most of the passages which Mr. Mitchell by means of this larceny has taken from our great bard, are parts as it were of a consecrated edifice. The abstraction of them from their hallowed precincts is a sort of profanation. It is the dilapidation of Shakspeare to furnish brick and cement to other writers. Now, that we may not appear unjustly querulous, we will subjoin a few instances out of many in which this has been done: "Double, double, toil and trouble." *Acharn.* 37. "Damned be he that first cries hold." *Ibid.* 48. "Looped and windowed raggedness." *Ibid.* 60. "All pomp and circumstance of glorious war." *Ibid.* 74. "Oh for a muse of fire." *Ibid.* 90. And in the *Knights*, p. 218,

"All these to hear
Did the grave council seriously incline."

Nor is it Shakspeare only on whom contributions are levied. *Hudibras* pays his share:

"—— do ribs of cold iron
My heart, man, inviron."

And in the same play occurs a well-known line:

"Or had practised oldest vices newest kind of ways."

Even Lord Foppington supplies his celebrated exclamation, "Snap my vitals."

Mr. Mitchell is frequently pleased to change the figure of the poet; an arbitrary and lawless procedure in our opinion, unless there exists an absolute necessity for it. Thus in the *Acharnians*, *Dicaeopolis* sums up his plagues, and contrasts them with his pleasurable sensations. Talking of the former, he says,

"Α' δ' ἀδυνασθῆναι χαμνοκοισιογάργαρα!"

a figure, of which the literal meaning is, that his afflictions equalled in number a mountain of sand. Mr. Mitchell paraphrastically substitutes a metaphor and a simile :

“ But for my plagues, they come in whole battalions,
In numbers numberless, like ocean's waves.”

With these exceptions, and others upon which we are unwilling to dilate, we gladly bear our testimony to the general spirit which characterizes these translations, and to the skill and versatility with which the chorusses and parabases are rendered. We are not indeed much enamoured of such metres as

“ Double, double, toil and trouble, quickly step and change
your plan,

Inquisition or petition must arrest the shameless man.”

But the sum of our opinions upon Mr. Mitchell's work is this ; that they are only fragments of translations ; scenes and dialogues being sometimes omitted, and supplied by a prose narration, often much longer than the passages that are not translated, in which Mr. Mitchell kindly undertakes the office of interlocutor, and, like Mr. Bayes, “ insinuates the plot into the boxes ;” that his notes are valuable elucidations of his author, and that some of the scenes are rendered with great felicity of execution. We shall conclude this article with a few extracts as specimens.

In the *Acharnians*, there is a paraphrastic but elegant transfusion into English verse of the hymn to Phales, beginning *Φαλης, εταυρε βακχχει*, with which we would willingly have treated our readers, were not the mysteries of the god somewhat too much revealed, in spite of the skill with which the grossness of the original is avoided. We insert the following translation of the exquisite Invocation to Peace, in the *Acharnians*, which the poet put into the mouth of Dicaëopolis, the chorus having already invoked the God of War :

Dic. “ Maid, whate'er thy appellation,
TRUCE, or RECONCILIATION,
Thee, I mean, whose fitmost place is
With fair Venus and the Graces,
(With them was thy earliest dwelling) ;—
Lovely charmer ! all excelling,
Did I see thee, nor discover
Gifts that might have won a lover
In that forehead op'ning fast,
In that boon and buxom air ?
But the dull delusion's over—
Call me instant from above
Him the winged child of love ;

Him that's drawn by painter's hand,
 Weaving roses in a band :
 He the holy priest shall be
 (Worthy thy fair self and me)
 To bind fast the chains, which never
 May our fates and fortunes sever.—
Perchance you think my heart is cold,
And mark my hairs, and say I'm old.
Old I own me, yet kind fate
Triple blessings did me wait,
 If my Not be join'd with thine—
 To plant in lengthen'd ranks the vine,
 'To graft the fig-tree's tender shoots,
 To pluck the vineyard's purpling fruits;—
 And olive-trees in many a row
 Around our farm shall circling grow,
 Fragrant oil and juice supplying
 To anoint our limbs at will,
 When yon moon but lately dying
 Once more begins her lamp to fill.” (P. 113—115.)

The lines in italics seem to have been suggested by Cowley's Ode of Anacreon,

“ Oft I'm by the women told,” &c.

We close our specimens of Mr. Mitchell's work with the following speech of Demosthenes, from the Knights, because it paints the sovereign people with admirable force and humour, and it is rendered with great spirit :

“ With reverence to your worships, 'tis our fate
 To have a testy, cross-grain'd, bilious, sour
 Old fellow for our master ; one much giv'n
 'To a bean-diet ; somewhat hard of hearing :
 Demus his name, sirs, of the parish Pynx here.
 Some three weeks back or so, this lord of ours
 Brought home a lusty slave from Paphlagonia,
 Fresh from the fan-yard, tight and yare, and with
 As nimble fingers and as foul a mouth
 As ever yet paid tribute to the gallows.
 'This tanner-Paphlagonian (for the fellow
 Wanted not penetration) bow'd and scrap'd,
 And fawn'd and wagg'd his ears and tail, dog-fashion ;
 And thus soon slipp'd into the old man's graces.
 Occasional douceurs of leather-parings,
 With speeches to this tune, made all his own.
 ‘ Good sir, the court is up,—you've judg'd one cause,—
 'Tis time to take the bath ; allow me, sir,—
 This cake is excellent—pray sup' this broth—
 This soup will not offend you, tho' cropfull—

You love an obolus; pray take these three—
 Honour me, sir, with your commands for supper.*
 Sad times meanwhile for us!—with prying looks,
 Round comes my man of hides, and if he finds us
 Cooking a little something for our master,
 Incontinently lays his paw upon it,
 And modestly in his own name presents it!
 It was but t'other day these hands had mixt
 A Spartan pudding for him; there—at Pylus:
 Silly and craftily the knave stole on me,
 Ravish'd the feast and to my master bore it.
 Then none but he, forsooth, must wait at table:
 (We dare not come in sight) but there he stands
 All supper-time, and with a leathern fly-flap
 Whisks off the advocates; anon the knave
 Chants out his oracles, and, when he sees
 The old man plung'd in mysteries to the ears,
 And scar'd from his few senses, marks his time,
 And enters on his tricks. False accusations
 Now come in troops; and at their heels the whip.
 Meanwhile the rascal shuffles in among us,
 And begs of one,—browbeats another,—cheats
 A third, and frightens all. 'My honest friends,
 These cords cut deep, you'll find it—I say nothing,—
 Judge you between your purses and your backs;
 I could, perhaps.'—We take the gentle hint,
 And give him all; if not, the old man's foot
 Plays such a tune upon our hinder parts,
 That flogging is a jest to't, a mere flea-bite—
 Wherefore, (*turning to Nicias*) befits it that we think what
 course
 To take, or where to look for help." (P. 161—164.)

ART. III.—*The Life of Voltaire, with interesting Particulars respecting his Death, and Anecdotes and Characters of his Contemporaries.* By Frank Hall Standish, Esq. 8vo. pp. 393. Andrews. London, 1821.

This is a panegyric on Voltaire, in which just so much of his wickedness is exhibited as was necessary to give some verisimilitude to the portrait; while most of the dark lines are softened off, and the whole is coloured with the glowing tints of philanthropy, philosophy, and lofty independence of character. A few examples of the author's *own* sentiments will be sufficient to show our readers how capable he is of doing justice to his hero.

Of the frequent *obscenity* of the volume we give no example; the biographer of Voltaire ought to be allowed some latitude in this respect, of his book would not be worthy of its subject. Mr. Standish's impurity has, however, the superadded merit of not being always necessary to his narrative; it is often gratuitous—he appears anxious to prove how well he has succeeded, not as a mere imitator or servile copyist, but in imbibing the true spirit of the author of “*La Pucelle*,” whom Rousseau himself could not tolerate within the limits of his republic, “because his plays corrupted the manners of the people.”

The following are Mr. Standish's mature ideas on the subject of love, friendship, marriage, and the female character. We quote some of the least licentious passages:

“A matrimonial alliance is generally formed for mutual convenience: the pure passion of love is debased by that of interest; but sincere friendship is a reciprocal interchange of benefits unmixed with any sordid consideration of advantage or requital.” (P. 93.)

“There are few women, of any temperament, who are not addicted to some vice, or to some pleasure. Though the Marquise du Châtelet loved celebrity and literature by profession, these were, even with her, secondary passions to intrigue and gambling. The former rendered her unfaithful to her husband, and afterwards to her lover; and the latter disturbed their mutual peace by embarrassing their fortune. No woman, however, united the power of pursuing dissipation and study at the same time, with so much success; and beholders saw with astonishment the commentatrix of Newton, after leaving a card-table, instruct, and converse with the learned and the gay. Her attachment to Voltaire added to the happiness of his life; and, though she occasionally provoked his jealousy, he loved her the better when it passed away; for, if any thing real, or which exists in this world, can at all approach to the representations of poetical love, or imaginary affection, it is a connexion of this nature, unmixed with interest, and unfettered by restraint.” (P. 163, 164.)

For a specimen of this writer's view of Divine Providence we give the following passage:

“Voltaire having been ordered by the king to select for him a public lecturer, recommended the Abbé de Prades. This is the same Abbé, who, being desirous of taking the title of doctor in theology, maintained, with the greatest intrepidity, at a full meeting in the Sorbonne, at Paris, the following doctrines: ‘That our soul is nothing more than an igneous fluid, after the opinion of the old fathers; that Moses is the most impudent of all historians, after some more learned men; and, lastly, that the miracles of Jesus Christ resembled those of Esculapius upon his own authority.’ This boldness in the promulgation of what were judged to be such detestable principles, gained the Abbé a great reputation over all Europe, and a small fortune at Berlin. Fre-

derick made him a prebendary, as well as a lecturer. Theopius lamented, and the wicked laughed at bad works producing such good fruit, *but the ways of Providence are inscrutable, and not to be measured by human rules, or laws.*" (P. 229.)

The following is Mr. Standish's view of *the duty* of suicide :

"The confiscation of a proscribed man's property is absurd ; for there are few who wish to live, after being deprived both of their honour and their fortune ; if he be a philosopher and a man of courage, he will deprive himself of life : and if a theologian, and not deficient in resolution, he will do the same." (P. 369.) /

We are at no loss to discover where our author learned this doctrine, for the theatre seems to be his church, and his priest is Voltaire. We have heard much respecting the moral lessons to be learned by the gross exhibitions which pollute the stage ; but we scarcely recollect any thing on this subject that can vie with the profane flippancy of the following passage :

"A fine play often produces as good feelings, or as much moral amelioration of character, and is often listened to with as much attention as the finest pulpit eloquence. The nearer examples of courage in the support of virtue, or constancy and firmness in distress, are brought before our eyes, while the tyranny of worldly opinions is triumphing or trampling over the endurance of philosophy, or fortitude, the more we can reconcile its influence to our own case ; and, even if we go back to antiquity for examples, there are few who will not allow the unconquerable spirit of Cato in Utica, whose mind could never be enslaved, although the universe was sinking beneath the powerful grasp of a successful rival, when brought before our view in the glowing colours of modern genius, *to be as striking as the most tranquil death-bed scene of the most pious Christian, commented on by holy writers, or approved by sanctified discourse.*" (P. 143, 144.)

Of the author's conception of the most common charities of our nature, the reader may form a judgment from the following picture of filial affection :

"Few things add so much to the enjoyment of literary fame, or the prosecution of literary acquirements, as independence. Voltaire owed his, principally to the London edition of the *Henriade* ; to fortunate speculations in the public funds ; and, to the death of his father—the last, though not the most amiable, yet the most secret and sincere, wish, of an expectant son." (P. 134.)

His religious opinions are very short and simple ; for example,

"Perhaps some may conclude by acquiescing in the opinion of the Dervise of the fable, who supposes us placed in this world, much on the same plan as rats inhabit a ship which the Grand Seignior sends to Egypt." (P. 289.)

"Occupation of mind, and the consolations of true religion, are

boasted of as the strongest antidotes to grief; but the speculations, or the experience of the sage, *as well as the resignation of the pious, are found useless and weak in calamity*; and the bitterness of sorrow triumphs over human theories." (P. 220, 221.)

The old catechisms taught, that man's chief end is to work out his salvation, to glorify God, and to enjoy his presence hereafter in heaven. Mr. Standish's idea respecting our probationary state is quite a discovery in moral science. We imagined it had always been allowed, even by those who consider Christianity a delusion, that at least it is often a happy one, and particularly in soothing the troubles of the mourner, and calming the bed of death. But Mr. Standish does not allow it even this faint praise. He knows as little of the history, as he does of the power, of *religion*.

Voltaire does not shine alone, in the pages before us; even Frederick, his master, comes in for his share of admiration; and is actually praised (p. 182) for his "*goodness of heart!*" Really this is insufferable; for if ever any one man has betrayed a more callous heart than all others, Voltaire always excepted, it was Frederic of Prussia, misnamed the Great. We should be glad to know what Mr. Standish would say to such a passage of history as the following:—A certain royal general, who possessed a large share of "*goodness of heart,*" intending one night to make an important movement in his camp, gave orders that by eight o'clock all the lights should be extinguished, under pain of death. *The instant the time arrived,* the general sallied out to see whether his orders were punctually obeyed. In the tent of captain Zietern he found a light. The captain, anxious to dispatch a letter which he was writing to his wife, had either not observed the signal, or had been led, in the ardour of his affection, to neglect it for a few moments, in order to finish his epistle, which he was actually folding at the moment the general entered his tent. A man of peculiar "*goodness of heart*" would, perhaps, have shut his eyes, or have framed or accepted some excuse to save the life of a valuable officer under such affecting circumstances; or if military discipline rendered that impossible, would at least have announced the fatal tidings in the least cruel manner which could be devised for the occasion. But Frederic's "*goodness of heart*" operated in a very different manner: he ordered the officer, who was on his knees pleading for mercy, to rise, and inform him to whom he had been writing. The unhappy man replied, that he had retained the light for a very few minutes only, in order to conclude a letter to his beloved wife. Frederic coolly ordered him to add one line more, which he would dictate, and which was to inform the unhappy woman, without assigning any reason, that before she received that

letter, the writer would be no more. Zieteru was obliged to obey, and the next morning he was shot. Such are the tender mercies of atheism. The military execution might be an affair of expediency; but the gratuitous superadded barbarity was the spontaneous effusion of Frederic's own "good heart." Perhaps, however, Mr. Standish would not see much barbarity in the transaction; for, in describing the inhuman tortures inflicted by the pagans on the early Christian martyrs, he is quite merry on the subject, and talks of "a droll picture of a man impaled," &c.

Voltaire, Frederic's best friend, the companion of his studies, and the corrector of his verses, or, as he himself termed it, "the washer of his dirty linen," could not long live with him, and has given in his letters the most disgusting picture of that heart which Mr. Standish conceives to have been *naturally* good, till it was corrupted by kingly power. While Frederic was professing the most ardent friendship for Voltaire, he was heard to say, that "he should not want him above twelve months longer;" adding, "we squeeze the orange, and throw away the rind." This remark soon came to Voltaire's ears; for this kind-hearted fraternity never kept any secrets, the knowledge of which would serve to wound and irritate the minds of their dear friends. Voltaire did not approve of this friendly squeeze, and prepared to decamp from the royal abode; hoping, before it was too late, as he himself remarks in one of his letters to Madame Denis, "to save the rind." He thus portrays, in the same letter, his beloved protector's character:—"I will compile a dictionary for the use of kings. *My friend*, signifies *my slave*;—*my dear friend*, is as much as to say, *you are more than indifferent to me*;—by *I will make you happy*, you are to understand, *I will bear with you so long as I shall need you*;—*sup with me to-night*, means, *I will make you my butt to-night*. This dictionary might be carried on to a great length, and be not unworthy a place in the encyclopædia." He goes on in the same strain. We recommend Mr. Standish to turn to the following passage, in particular, as peculiarly characteristic of the good-hearted Frederic: "What! delight in making mischief among those who live with him! To say every thing that is kind to a person, and write pamphlets against him! To lure a man from his country, by the most endearing expressions and solemn promises, and to treat him with the blackest malice! What a contrast! And this is the man who wrote in such a philosophic strain [Mark, Mr. Standish], that I mistook him for a philosopher, and styled him *The Solomon of the North*." Voltaire adds, with more than his usual truth, "He said you are a philosopher, and so am I;—but I begin to see *that neither of us is so*."

But we needed not to have referred to the page of history, or to the letters of Voltaire; for Mr. Standish's own book records anecdotes in abundance of this monarchical freethinker; proving him to have been as hard-hearted as he was vain, licentious, and over-bearing. We present the following portrait, from Mr. Standish's pencil, for the admiration of those who would wish to behold "a truly philosophical" king:

"This singular government,—these manners still more strange,—this contrast of stoicism and epicurism,—of severity in the military discipline,—and of effeminacy in the interior of the palace,—*the pages with whom he used to amuse himself in his cabinet*, and soldiers passing the gauntlet six and thirty times under the windows of the King, who was looking on at the punishment,—discourses on morality, and an unruly licentiousness, composed a fantastical picture, with which few persons were acquainted at that time, and which has since been never beheld in Europe." (P. 201.)

"Whether it was through economy, or through policy, Frederick did not grant the least favour to his old favourites, and, above all, to those who had exposed their lives in his service, when he was Prince Royal. He did not pay the money which he had then borrowed: and, as Louis XII. did not revenge the injuries he had experienced when Duke of Orleans, the King of Prussia forgot the debts of the Prince Royal. The poor mistress, who had been whipped for him by the hand of the executioner, was married to the clerk of the hackney-coach office, for there were eighteen hackney-coaches in Berlin; and her former lover presented her with a yearly pension of seventy crowns, which was always paid with the greatest exactness. Her name was Shommers, a tall woman, very thin, with the look of a sybil, who did not appear to be worth undergoing a flogging for a prince. Nevertheless, when at Berlin, Frederick displayed much sumptuousness on public days. It was a splendid sight to see him at table, surrounded by twenty princes of the empire, served on the finest gold plate in Europe, and thirty fine pages, and as many young edukes, richly dressed, bearing large dishes of solid gold. The great officers were then seen; but, except at such times, they never appeared. After dinner, they used to go to the opera, in a large house, three hundred feet long, which one of his chamberlains, named Knoberstoff, built without the help of an architect. The best singers, and the best dancers, were in his pay. La Barbarani was then performing on his theatre. She afterwards married the son of his chancellor. The king had ordered this dancer to be taken away from Venice by some soldiers, and she was brought by way of Vienna up to Berlin. He was rather in love with her, because her legs resembled those of a man. A singular thing is, that he used to give her thirty-two thousand francs, as yearly wages. His Italian poet, who used to make verses for the operas, of which he formed the plan himself, had only twelve hundred francs a year; but, it is to be considered he was very ugly, and could not dance. La Barbarani had alone more than the emolument of three ministers of state together. As to the Italian poet, he one day paid himself. He stole

from a chapel, used by the first King of Prussia, some old gold galoons, with which it was ornamented. The king, who never frequented a church, said, that he found himself no loser. Besides, he had just been writing a dissertation in favour of thieving, which is printed in the collection of his academy; and he did not think it proper, at this time, to belie his writings by his actions. This indulgence, however, was not extended towards the military. There was a gentleman of Franche Comté, in the prisons of Spandau, six feet high, whom the late king had enticed away on account of his tallness. They had promised him the place of chamberlain, and allotted him that of a common soldier. The poor man soon after deserted, with a few more of his comrades: he was seized, and brought before his Majesty, to whom he was either magnanimous, or simple, enough to observe, he only repented of one thing, which was not having killed such a tyrant. For this answer, his nose and his ears were cut off; he was made to pass the gauntlet six-and-thirty times, and afterwards sent to Spandau to work on the public roads. He was working still when Mr. de Valori, the French envoy, begged Voltaire to ask his pardon from the very clement son of the very cruel Frederick William. His majesty was pleased to say, that it was for him, *la Clemenza di Tito* was performed; a beautiful opera, by the celebrated Metastasio, put into music by the king himself, aided by the Italian. He took a good opportunity of recommending to his consideration the case of the poor Franche Comtois, without ears and without a nose, and composed the following appeal in his favour:

Génte universel, ame sensible et ferme,
 Quoi ! lorsque vous régniez, il est des malheureux !
 Aux tourmens d'un coupable il vous faut mettre un terme
 Et ne'n mettre jamais à vos soins généreux.
 Voyez auprès de vous les prières tremblantes,
 Filles du repentir, maîtresses des grand cœurs
 S'étonner d'arroser de larmes impuissantes
 Les mains qui de la terre ont du sécher les cœurs.
 Ah ! pourquoi m'étaler, avec magnificence,
 Ce spectacle brillant où triomphe Titus ?
 Pour achever la fête, égalez sa clémence,
 Et l'imitiez en tout, ou ne le vantez plus.

"The request was strong; but it had the advantage of being in verse. The king promised some lenity, and even some months after, he had the goodness to put the old gentleman into the hospital at six sous a day. He had refused that favour to the queen his mother, who, very likely, had asked for it in prose." (P. 202—205.)

There is nothing in this passage respecting some of Frederick's grosser gratifications, or of those scenes of which even Mr. Standish, who is not very squeamish, is obliged to exclaim, "Modesty prevents the biographer from proceeding with the details," though, by the way, modesty does not perform the same useful office for our author on many other equally necessary occasions. Those who are able to form any idea of what modesty

is, well know that it is not so much by facts gravely and severely stated, as by the flippant description of them, and the inuendoes of a vicious mind, that that estimable virtue is outraged. There are minds which can extract indecency from the very smile of a sleeping infant, and make all nature one vast hot-bed of animal grossness.

But it is necessary that we should describe Mr. Standish's work a little more methodically. The first chapter, containing more than seventy pages out of the 393 of which this *twelve shilling* volume is composed, enters upon the state of France during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in order "to enable the reader more completely to appreciate the miseries under which that nation laboured previous to the appearance of Voltaire, and to more readily estimate the value of any exertions he may have used in the removal of errors and superstitious prejudices." With this worthy object in view, Mr. Standish thinks it expedient to give us his ideas upon the Reformation, the invention of printing, the sale of indulgences, Luther, Calvin, superstition, witchcraft, magic, duelling, chivalry, and a variety of other topics, which not only serve admirably to swell out the volume to the size of the bookseller's very moderate demand, but to convey a few preparatory doses of impiety and obscenity, in order to prepare the reader for what follows. Of the gross misrepresentations which abound in this part of the volume, we say nothing; much less shall we notice the affectation of fine writing which pervades the whole work; and that without any great pretensions either to taste or grammar. Mr. Standish is perfectly at liberty, if he so please, to inform us that "the Bishop of Annecy was much grieved when he saw Voltaire among the number of his *diocesans*"—meaning, among the inhabitants in his diocese—and to translate "un dévot lit l'Évangile," "a devotee reads the *Evangelist*," meaning the Gospel, or the New Testament, Mr. Standish not, perhaps, being aware that there are *four* Evangelists. These are trifles, except so far as they show how qualified the author was for the task he has undertaken, and as they may happily diminish his popularity with any stray school-boy who should happen to be in danger of imbibing his opinions. But the moral delinquencies of the volume are of greater importance, and deserve a more full exposure and a heavier castigation.

His preliminary dissertations in the first chapter being concluded, the author thus commences the life of his hero, in the second:

"The progress which had been made in philosophy and letters, [where?] during the reign of Louis XIV., together with the discoveries of Newton, and other men of science in foreign countries, burst the strong

fetters of ignorance and doubt, which had long enslaved the world. The old rules of the stage, had been revived by Corneille and Racine, and the ancient connexion of time, place and action, which had gradually fallen into disuse among the moderns, were again illustrated and brought into practice by these celebrated tragic writers; by which the drama was advanced to a state of perfection which it had never till then attained. The influence of superstition and ignorance, however, still prevailed: and it was to remove those evils of vice and hypocrisy, to which the former gave rise, that the subject of these pages dedicated his life, his fortune, and his talents." (P. 75, 76.)

Let the admiring reader pause to observe the felicitous logic of this introductory paragraph; let him mark the sublimity of the climax in the first sentence, in which we are told what benefits accrued to the world from the progress made in philosophy and letters, from the discoveries of Newton, and from "the revival of the old rules of the stage;" and let him especially notice the truly syllogistic force of the "however," in the next sentence; from which we learn that, notwithstanding literature had advanced, and Newton had written, and Corneille and Racine had purified the stage, "superstition and ignorance," that is, Christianity and faith in the Gospel, still prevailed. But let us proceed to the next page:

"Even as an infant, young Arouet [such was Voltaire's family name] attracted admiration by the boldness of his genius, and the originality of his remarks. The Abbé de Chateau Neuf, who was his god-father, had the charge of his education. This man had, early in life, either from thoughtlessness or ambition, assumed the ecclesiastical robe; but disappointed by the restraint, and disgusted at the hypocrisy of his institution, he preferred the enjoyment of liberty to the chance of sacerdotal dignities, and resigned his fortune with his gown. No one who forsakes the church looks back with complacency on its members; from enthusiasm to infidelity there is often but one step, and perhaps the asperity of the Abbé's remarks upon his own order, influenced the satirical vein of his godson." (P. 77, 78.)

This short passage conveys much latent instruction, particularly as it shows us some of the elements of which irreligion and democracy are compounded. This Abbé de Chateau Neuf was one of the last lovers of the infamous Ninon de l'Enclos, whom even Mr. Standish describes, in his easy anacreontic manner, as a woman "who conceived it foolish to testify an exclusive attachment to any single object; and in whom sensuality assumed the place of more fixed love or Platonic affection." The Abbé was an inmate in the family of Voltaire's father, and introduced his hopeful god-son to the aforesaid Madame Ninon, and various other goodly personages. It is horrible to learn, that it was from his god-father that Voltaire imbibed his first principles of infidelity, and that in the periods of sickness in which the Abbé

attended his couch. But the principal instruction which we referred to as deducible from the passage just quoted, is the secret motive of the Abbé's conduct: he cannot submit to "the restraints" of the ecclesiastical profession; and having emancipated himself from them, he becomes the champion of infidelity, and the calumniator of his order; for "no one who forsakes the church, looks back with complacency on its members." We can assure Mr. Standish that his remark applies very widely; and that most of the young men who affect scepticism, are those who cannot submit to the "restraints" of religion; and who, having thrown off the yoke of Christianity, in order more freely to indulge their licentious appetites, become its foes and persecutors.

Mr. Standish barks as loudly at priests as Voltaire himself; though he does not bite as keenly as a mastiff. We are indebted to his want of power alone, that his work does not render both the throne and the altar contemptible. It, however, incidentally defeats its own aim, by the exhibition of facts which speak far more forcibly than the most elaborate arguments. If we wish to see the character of the new philosophy, we need only read the lives of its adepts. It is disgusting to witness the pride, petulance, self-conceit, meanness, falsehood, and tyranny which mark almost every page of their memorable history. The life of Voltaire, as it was, or even as Mr. Standish has painted it, is quite enough to satisfy every reasonable mind as to the character of his politics and religion.

Voltaire, while quite a child, was pronounced by one of the professors whose instructions he attended, "to be devoured (we give our author's words) by the desire of celebrity, and to be destined to be the apostle of Deism in France." The promulgation of Deism, therefore, it seems, originated in personal vanity. We admire such unintended juxta-positions, of which Mr. Standish's work furnishes many; as, for example, where, after describing a "most beautiful" painting which hung in the king of Prussia's sitting-room, designed by the king himself, but of so monstrously and brutally libidinous a character, that we cannot even hint at its subject, he remarks, in the very next sentence, (p. 198,) "Never did any class of men speak so freely of all the superstitions of mankind, and never were they treated with so much ridicule and contempt. God alone was respected; but they did not spare any of those who had made use of his name to deceive their fellow creatures. *Women and priests never entered the palace.*" Good, very good, Mr. Standish! It was, however, far more to the credit of women and priests, than to that of Frederic and his philosophical junto, that the former kept aloof from this regal den of abominations. Priests were,

however, sometimes of use; for when Voltaire wanted a person on whom he could depend, to manage his pecuniary concerns, he committed them to the care of a priest, aye, and a Jansenist too; of whom Mr. Standish relates, that "he was equally trusted by his own brotherhood, and by his more enlightened client."

The abovementioned "desire of celebrity" led young Arouet to many performances which displayed his real character; among others, to compose a lampoon, which caused him to be expelled in disgrace from his father's house, and sent to Holland as a page in the service of the French ambassador. Here he formed an attachment to the daughter of a woman who conducted "a scandalous and libellous journal, which gained her a subsistence, and only attracted notice for its impudence." The woman had two daughters, one of whom he allured and ruined.

But we are not about to enter on his history, the principal facts of which may be found in a variety of quarters, and need no comment to point out their moral. We have, however, a few remarks yet to make, both on our author's hero and his work.

We have really been often surprised to hear the glowing terms in which some foreigners, especially Frenchmen,—and, for the sake of our author, we must add a few "enlightened philosophers" nearer home, are accustomed to speak of Voltaire. In our view, never was there a man less deserving of love or esteem. He was proverbially cold-hearted, pceivish, and satirical; and Mr. Standish himself allows that "his countenance expressed wit, mingled with malignity."

But wit and malignity were not Voltaire's only characteristics; his arrogance was notorious; his best friends could not brook it; and his hypocrisy and dastardly spirit were even, if possible, more conspicuous than his arrogance. Mr. Standish might have enriched his volume, without much research, with reams of anecdote and documents to this effect. In the whole of the philosophic war, Voltaire's maxim was, "Strike, but conceal." We find him constantly writing to his confederates in such terms as the following:—"Confound the wretch [their enigmatical name for Christianity and its adorable Author] to the utmost of your power: speak your mind boldly; but when you strike, conceal your hand. You may be known; for there are persons sufficiently keen-scented to suspect you, but they will not be able to bring conviction home." Again: "The Nile is said to spread around its fertilizing waters, though it conceals its head; do you the same, and you will secretly enjoy your triumph. I recommend the wretch to you. We embrace the worthy knight, and exhort him to conceal his march from the enemy." Voltaire was much vexed, because greatly alarmed

when suspected of being the author of any obnoxious publication; for the usage of Ferney had none of that instinctive greatness of mind, which forbids a man to write what he would be ashamed to own. Speaking of the Philosophical Dictionary, he says to D'Alembert, "The greatest service you can do me, is to assert, though you even pledge your share in paradise, that I had no hand in that hellish work. There are three or four people, who perpetually repeat that I have supported the good cause, and that I fight mortally against the wild beasts. It is betraying one's brethren, to praise them on such an occasion; those good souls ruin me with their commendations. It is certainly, say they, his; it is in his style and manner! Ah, my brethren, what fatal words! you should, on the contrary, cry out in the public streets, 'It is not he;' for the monster must fall, pierced by a hundred invisible hands; yes; let it fall beneath a thousand repeated blows." The whole of Voltaire's confidential correspondence is to the same effect; and he expressly tells D'Alembert, in one of his letters, that they were "to act as conspirators, not as zealots."

But in nothing did Voltaire evidence his cowardly hypocrisy more, than in his conduct towards the established church of his country, in the most solemn rites in which he did not scruple to assist, in order the better to carry on his nefarious projects, while he shielded himself from public reprobation. Some of his friends were heartily ashamed of his odious dissimulation in this respect; but he never felt shame for himself on the subject. He says, in a letter to one of his female confidantes, the actress Clairon, "I am now sixty-seven years old. I go to the parochial mass. I edify my people. I am building a church. I receive the communion. I believe in Jesus Christ, &c. . . . Ye base persecutors, what have you to say to me? 'Why, did you not write *La Pucelle*?' No, I never did. I am a good Christian, a faithful servant of the king, a good lord of the parish, and a proper guardian for any young lady, &c. These are the answers I make to the Fantins, Grisels, Guyons, or the little black monkey," &c. &c. A man who can write in this way is, to our minds, a being below contempt; a being whom no possible aggregation of learning and talents could redeem from infamy. Yet it is to the malice of his genius, rather than to the powers of his understanding or imagination, that Voltaire owes his success and his popularity. His versatility of parts was, without doubt, extraordinary; he could write tragedies and comedies, and act them when he had written them; he was a poet, a logician, a metaphysician, an historian, a lexicographer. But he was great in nothing, except in the gigantic atrocity of his war against Heaven. It was as impossible even to respect the intellectual

side of his character. He that could write elaborate verses in his study, commit them carefully to memory, and then pass them off as extempore effusions, deserved to have the confidential secretary, who picked up the fragments of his papers, torn into a multitude of pieces, and informed the world of the imposition. We cannot resist giving, from Mr. Standish's pages, one more anecdote, as strikingly illustrative of this littleness in Voltaire's character. If the reader were not acquainted with the names of Frederic the Great, and the sage of Ferney, he might imagine himself reading a transaction between two chambermaids, or a cook and her scullion.

"In the agreement made by him with the King of Prussia, besides the key of chamberlain, and the cross of merit, he stipulated for the usual allowance of a minister of state, that is to say, nearly twenty thousand francs a year, besides a lodging in the palace, a seat at the king's table, fuel, and two wax candles a day; and he was allowed, every month, so many pounds of sugar, tea, coffee, and chocolate; articles which the gentlemen of the bed-chamber valued at as much more. But it so happened that, either by design, or accident, they were in the habit of giving Voltaire sugar badly refined, spoiled tea, bad coffee, and ill-made chocolate. He suspected, perhaps, that this was done by Frederick's own orders; and whether it was that he wanted to know the truth, or correct the abuse, he complained of such bad treatment. Whatever orders the king might have given, no alteration took place; and Voltaire, more indignant than ever, did not fail to repeat his cause of grievance. 'Come, my dear friend,' said the king, 'you can do very well without those trifling provisions, they cause you too much anxiety. I shall give orders that they may be suppressed in future.' This conclusion astonished Voltaire. It seems, thought he, they follow the maxim of 'let each gain or save as he can;' the worst case on these occasions is to be made the dupe.

"He accordingly began to sell the twelve pounds of wax candles he received monthly; and in order to have a light in his apartment, he took care, every evening, to go several times to his rooms under different pretences, and to take each time one of the largest wax-candles from the king's apartments; which he did not bring back, and which he might have called, with very good reason, the substitutes for his sugar and coffee. These circumstances could not fail to produce a dislike between the parties." (P. 230—232.)

It is humiliating to human nature, that a man of such a character, should have been able to impose himself on the world for a philosopher, and to have become the leader of a powerful sect. Voltaire reigned by terror; his sarcastic powers were ever on the alert to ridicule whoever or whatever was opposed to his views. His chief engine was the French Academy, which he governed with absolute controul; and by means of his artifices soon filled its ranks with members of his own fraternity.

Voltaire well understood his business; some were afraid of his

wit and malevolence; others hoped, by aping his infidelity, to share his literary reputation; and thus, by a well-combined application of various instruments, he contrived to bring most of the leading men in politics and letters under his control. With liberty for his motto, he was in his practice a despot. He tolerated nothing that opposed his wishes; his best friends must submit or part; and no man could have kept a mere keen glance upon their faults and failings. Not a word that they said or wrote escaped his notice. D'Alembert, under the article "Dictionary," in the Encyclopedia, had used the following expression, in reference to Bayle: "Happy had it been if he had paid greater respect to morals and religion." Voltaire eagerly writes to him, that "he had read that expression with horror, and that D'Alembert ought to the last hour of his life to repent deeply of those two lines." Poor D'Alembert is terrified and writes a penitential reply, stating that he had only used the words as terms of course, "pour servir de passe-port à la vérité;" that is of infidelity—we suppose we must not say of atheism, for Voltaire was almost persuaded by the testimonies of his senses to be always a professed Theist. He averred that there was no proof that a God did *not* exist, that the thing was possible, and that there were even some probabilities in favour of the hypothesis. Some of his friends considered this his "weak side;" Diderot in particular remarks, in one of his letters, "Ce pauvre Voltaire radote un peu: il avouait l'autre jour qu'il croyait à l'être du Dieu." We wonder Mr. Standish did not embellish his pages with this anecdote in honour of his hero; he could not surely think such a profession a piece of "radoterie" in that otherwise great man.

We will sum up the offences of our author, by extracting his unfair and mutilated account of Voltaire's last hours. He had travelled all the way from Ferney, near Geneva, to Paris, to see his play performed; a worshipper of himself, on the brink of eternity.

"Although he was still unwell, he received the actors and actresses, who were to perform in *Irène*, at his house. They rehearsed before him as he lay in bed; and, at this time, he sat up a whole night, correcting the fifth act of the tragedy. During one of the rehearsals, he broke a blood-vessel. The Abbé Gaultier came to visit him, but required a public profession of his faith, and the wits in Paris wrote a parody on the priest and the profession. The day after the visit of the Abbé, he recommenced the rehearsals of *Irène*, of which he had not a very favourable opinion; and it was on this occasion, that he observed with pleasantry, 'It would be sad for me to have come to Paris, only to be confessed and hissed.'

"This play had already arrived at its sixteenth representation; but he had not been able to attend, although perpetually called for by the

public. The illness from which he had just escaped (which is dangerous at all ages, and generally mortal at so advanced a period of life), added to the interest which the public took in him, and rendered them more solicitous in their visits. Two sentinels were placed at the box-door of the gentlemen of the bed-chamber to the king, where he sat with the Marquise de Villette. He had hardly entered, when the spectators rose, some incited by the pleasure of seeing him in better health; others by the respect they considered they owed to a philosopher, who had filled all Europe with his fame and literary glory. This was the first homage he received. The audience then simultaneously clapped their hands with excessive joy, and a thousand voices from every corner exclaimed, 'Let him be crowned.' Buzard, the actor, who performed so well the character of a high priest, in obedience to the public voice, proceeded to the coronation. The modesty of Voltaire for some time hesitated in receiving the honour,—the first of that sort hitherto known in France; but at last he accepted it amidst cries of 'It is the public that sends it.'

"Shouts of applause continued till the close of the theatre, indeed for nearly four hours. During the two representations of the tragedy, and the after-piece, the comedians paid him a compliment, equally unexpected by himself and by the public. It was the inauguration of his statue. The curtain rose, displaying, in the middle of the stage, his bust, done by Caffieri, and placed on a pedestal. All the actors and actresses, each in an appropriate dress, were grouped in a semicircle around it, holding in their hands a crown of laurel, after which they chanted the name of Voltaire at distinct intervals. (P. 373—375.)

From this scene he returned home, as he expressed it, "to expire covered with glory." His illness and death shortly succeeded.

"The curate of Saint Sulpice, and the Abbé Gaultier, who had formerly attended him, being made acquainted with his danger, were permitted to see him in the presence of his niece, his nephews, and his friends. The curate approached the pillow of the dying man, and asked him whether he had faith in the divinity of Jesus Christ. The philosopher was insensible, and did not hear the question; or, if he did, did not deign [deign! good, very good, Mr. Standish] to answer. The curate profited by the silence to explain to his friends and his relations his reasons for such a demand. 'As,' said he, 'in the works attributed to him, the divinity of Jesus Christ is strongly attacked, I think it my duty to acquaint myself with these points of his belief.' M. le Marquis de Ville Vieille then addressed him, and thinking that he should not be heard, cried in his ear with a loud voice, 'Here is the Abbé Gaultier, your confessor.' The philosopher, *probably delirious*, [good again] to the great astonishment of the assistants, replied, 'The Abbé Gaultier, my confessor; pray make my compliments to him.' They then announced the curate of Saint Sulpice. Voltaire is said to have raised himself from his bed, and extended his hand for salutation. When the clergyman said, 'Sir, do you acknowledge the divinity of Jesus Christ?' he replied, 'For the love

of God, do not mention that man's name.' These were his last words; at which, observes Duvernet, 'All free-thinkers will be very much delighted, but which are certainly calculated to make Christians shudder.'

"The Curate of Saint Sulpice, no doubt alarmed at this reply, retired, and announced to the rest of his fraternity at Paris, that Voltaire had died as great a Deist as he lived; that he would not bury him; and that, if the commands of his superior obliged him to perform the office, he would have the body dug up during the night. This report, although not very probable, as it was mentioned publicly, I have thought it my duty to record. It may be also right to contradict a common belief that was then circulated, which said, that as soon as the Abbé Gaultier had left the apartment, Voltaire raised himself on his pillow, and repeated the four following lines:

Tandis que j'ai vécu, on m'a vu hautement,
Aux badauds effarés, dire mon sentiment,
Je veux le dire encore dans les royaumes sombres
S'ils ont des préjugés, j'en guérirai les ombres.

"This anecdote is false, as well as many others, then in circulation. The verses had been written ten years before, and when Voltaire was in the full enjoyment of health. It appears like an idle boast his repeating them on his death-bed; but the truth is, that he died peacefully, with the resignation and calmness of a philosopher. His body was embalmed, and carried at night out of Paris to the convent of Sellieres, of which his nephew, Mignot, was abbot. His heart was sent to his friend the Marquise de Villette, enclosed in a sarcophagus, which was placed in the chamber in which he used to study, and on which the following inscription was written: 'His heart is here, and his genius is every where.'

"Opinions have been, and are likely to remain, various, with regard to the real state in which Voltaire expired. His friends describe him as sinking into the grave like a philosopher: others, among whom are the physicians in attendance, describe him as suffering great agonies, and terrified by his approaching dissolution. Between two such different accounts probability might induce those unbiassed to incline to the former. No doubt the opium which he had swallowed might cause delirium; [very good again]; and the religious would magnify indications of weakness, to which the strongest minds are liable, into fear of a future existence; whilst d'Alembert would be unwilling to allow, that the tortures of his body on so trying an occasion would ever cause even a temporary perversion of his sentiments." (P. 378—381.)

With this description the reader will contrast the well-known account given by the Abbé Barruel, who described the rage, the terror, the horrors of the expiring philosopher, in terms which no man can read without shuddering. Mr. Standish has given us no evidence to attest his statements; the Abbé has given both facts and authorities. The physicians, who are the most unexceptionable witnesses, Mr. Standish himself cannot deny,

deposed to the truth of those facts. Since the Abbé Barruel wrote, various direct attestations to the truth of his narrative have been given to the public; and among others, a most convincing letter, by M. de Luc, written in consequence of a denial of the Abbé's statement having been sent to the British Critic. This letter will be found appended to the first volume of the latter editions of Barruel's work. But, what is still *more* convincing, several *unintentional* corroborations of Barruel's story have appeared within the last few years. A life of Marmontel, written by himself, was translated into English a few years since, in which even that friend and admirer of Voltaire incidentally confirms the fact of the extreme misery of his last hours, which were truly such, that Barruel might well exclaim, "Let not the historian fear exaggeration. Rage, remorse, reproach, and blasphemy, all accompany and characterize the long agony of the dying atheist. This death, the most terrible that is ever recorded to have stricken the impious man, will not be denied by his companions in impiety; their silence, however much they may wish to deny it, is the least of those corroborative proofs which could be adduced. Not one of the sophisters has ever dared to maintain any sign given of resolution or tranquillity by the premier chief during the space of three months, which elapsed from the time he was crowned at the theatre, until his decease. Such a silence expresses how great their humiliation was in his death."

We have been led to speak the more strongly, both respecting the volume of Mr. Standish and the subject of his narrative, because we cannot but consider the publication of such a work at such a moment, a serious offence against the peace and good order of society. Voltaire has ever been the idol and the oracle of the dissolute, the irreligious, the discontented, and the seditious. At this moment in various parts of Europe his works are assiduously forced into circulation; in Spain in particular, one of the first uses made of the abolition of the Inquisition and the relaxations of the press, was to inundate that country with his pestiferous writings. Ten years ago there were but three editions in the book-market, in that country, and of these there were far more copies on hand than would supply for some time to come, the very limited demand. But since 1817, seven or eight new editions have been printed, and these in different sizes, 8vo. 12mo. 18mo. and at various prices, so as to suit all classes of purchasers. An individual has announced a new edition comprised in fifteen volumes, at forty sous per volume; so that the whole of Voltaire's works may be had for thirty francs! The typographical execution must of course be vile in the extreme, but *n'importe*—kitchen-maids and stable-boys

are not very nice in these respects; the cheapness with them is the great object; and those who can pay more liberally for their intellectual repast may have it served up in better style. This, by the way, exceeds all that Voltaire himself, with all his vanity, could have anticipated; for he often speaks in his letters of the difficulty of inoculating the less educated ranks of the community with his doctrines. He writes to D'Alembert, in September 1768: "Both you and Damilaville must be well pleased to see the contempt in which *the wretch* is fallen among the better sort of people throughout Europe; *their* suffrages are all we wished for or thought necessary; *we never pretended to enlighten housemaids and shoemakers*; we leave *them* to the apostles." There were at this time no *thirty franc* editions; the higher departments of society and the more exalted ranks of intellect were alone exposed to the poison. Voltaire and his allies employed the elaborate machinery of an Encyclopedia; but "Satan now is wiser than of yore," and has taught the art of condensing the "leperous distillments" of blasphemy, irreligion, and sedition, into two-penny pamphlets and nursery ballads. This indeed does not surprize us in an age in which the powers of the steam engine are employed to chop minced meat;* and penny subscriptions are set on foot to buy seats in the imperial parliament. Our Hones, and Woolers, and Cobbetts, are wiser than their precursor of Ferney; they do not confine themselves to men of condition or men of letters; but rely upon a *levy en massé*. and hope to make up by physical force what they want in intellect and moral worth. Frederic of Prussia used to ridicule the political system of Voltaire and his fraternity, as a project which bore more the marks of a scheme framed by a knot of literary speculators than by men acquainted with the actual business of the world. Thus, he remarks in his *Refutation of the System of Nature*: "The Encyclopedists are universal reformers. France, according to their plan, is to form a republic, and a *mathematician* is to be its legislator. Mathematicians are to govern it, and to work all the operations of the new republic *by fluxions*. This republic is to live in perpetual peace, and to support itself without an army!" Our working infidels surpass Voltaire in their political wisdom; for Voltaire was not himself a republican, though he could not control his followers; and was willing to sacrifice his cooler political sentiments to the common object of extirpating Christianity. This, with him, was always "*le grand poisson qui mange tous les petits*." But setting this, his ulterior view, aside, Voltaire might have learned from Montesquieu that his egotism was likely to be less pampered in a state of which virtue was necessarily the basis.

* This is literally a fact, at several shops in the metropolis.

ART. IV.—*Memoirs of the Rebellion in 1745 and 1746.* By the Chevalier de Johnstone, Aid-de-Camp to Lord George Murray, General of the Rebel Army, &c. Containing a Narrative of the Progress of the Rebellion, from its Commencement to the Battle of Culloden; the Characters of the principal Persons engaged in it, and Anecdotes respecting them; and various important Particulars relating to that Contest, hitherto either unknown or imperfectly understood. With an Account of the Sufferings and Privations experienced by the Author after the Battle of Culloden, before he effected his Escape to the Continent, &c. &c. Translated from a French MS. originally deposited in the Scots College at Paris, and now in the Hands of the Publishers. Longman and Co. London, 1820.

THE Chevalier de Johnstone was the only son of a respectable family at Edinburgh. After a youth spent in frivolity and debauchery, he went at the age of eighteen into Russia to visit his two uncles, who had risen high in the Russian service. The advantages of their protection and of that of their friend, Field Marshal Keith, inspired him with the wish of pursuing a military career in the same country; but the authority of his father, who opposed the measure, and threatened to punish his disobedience by disinheriting him, put a stop to the project. He returned to London; and after four or five months of dissipation, spent without plan or aim, he returned to Edinburgh, where he seems to have remained till Charles Stuart descended from the highlands into the lowlands of Scotland; Johnstone was at that time about five-and-twenty years of age. He had been educated in Jacobite principles, and his sister had married into the family of Lord Rolls, who had taken an active share in the preceding rebellion. Accordingly, when the rebels approached Perth, Johnstone joined their standard, received a captain's commission, and continued with them till their final dispersion. After the battle of Culloden he escaped into Holland in the suite of Lady Jane Douglas, who afterwards attracted so much public notice in the contested succession to the estates of her brother the Duke of Douglas: but instead of proceeding immediately to Russia and availing himself of the influence of his uncles in that country, he hastened to Paris, in the expectation that the French court would ere long make a powerful effort to replace the family of Stuart on the English throne. In 1749, a pension was granted him of 2,000 livres. He soon afterwards accepted an ensigncy in the French service, in the hopes and with the assurance of speedy promotion. With this rank he was sent to Louisbourg, where he had not

long been, when his name was struck off the pension list, and his means of subsistence were reduced to the mere amount of his pay, that is, to 400 livres per annum. He therefore paid a visit to Europe to solicit promotion, but he was soon obliged to return to his station, where, to beguile the solitude to which his poverty doomed him, he had recourse to the study of the principal French authors, who have written on the military art. In 1754 he received a lieutenancy; but not long afterwards the capture of Louisbourg by those very English regiments which he had assisted in routing at Preston-Pans, forced him to withdraw into Canada: and from that province, when the French were driven out of it, he retired into France, where he spent the remainder of his days in penury and discontent.

These memoirs seem to have been written in the latter period of his life, though there is no internal evidence to fix the precise time. One part of them contains an account of the proceedings of the rebels up to the time of their final rout: the other and much more interesting half is occupied with his own personal adventures in effecting his escape into France, and with the course of his fortunes in that country. The editor and translator (for the memoirs were written in French) regards them as furnishing important materials for future historians. In this opinion, inspired by a very natural partiality for a work on which he has spent his time and labour, we cannot altogether coincide: for these Memoirs do not, so far as we can observe, throw any additional light on the leading transactions in the Rebellion of 1745. Mr. Johnstone was too young and too inexperienced a man, we may add also, of too shallow a capacity, to be admitted into the councils of the leaders, or to form a sound opinion of what was going on from the parts which fell under his immediate observation. Zeal, courage, and a good constitution seem to have been his principal military qualifications: his subsequent misfortunes, indeed, forced him to seek amusement in the cultivation of his intellect, but that cultivation never extended beyond the usual limits of the attainments of a French subaltern, that is, the perusal of a few writers on tactics, with some scraps of morals and history. The narrow range of Mr. Johnstone's ideas is conspicuous in every part of his book, and never more so than when he would fain soar to general and philosophical truth. It is not from such a writer that we can expect much information on the progress of a civil war; besides, his accuracy is not always to be depended on; he frequently falls into mistakes concerning times, places, and persons. Whatever he himself believed he seems to have given as a fact, without taking the trouble to state the species of evidence on which his belief rested: and in particular he appears to have often confounded what he had heard with

what he knew from his own observation. As he wrote after the lapse of a considerable interval, it is not wonderful that he should have fallen into errors; still, this occasional inaccuracy, though arising from a very natural and pardonable cause, is not on that account the less injurious to the value of the work, considered as supplying materials for history; because, wherever its statements differ from other narratives, the credibility due to them cannot be easily ascertained.

At the same time that we are of opinion that these memoirs might have slumbered in manuscript without exciting much regret in the historic muse, we are far from thinking their publication either useless or superfluous. A book may be read with both pleasure and advantage, though every fact mentioned in it, which is of any consequence as a matter of history, may be found more correctly stated elsewhere. The Rebellion of 1745 well deserves to occupy both the understanding and the imagination of Englishmen: it is a scene to which all who take an interest in the history of their country must often revert. Home's account of it is deficient in animation, and though in general accurate so far as it goes, too often shrinks from declaring the whole truth. Johnstone tells his story under the influence of different prejudices and feelings; and though he instructs us less, he perhaps interests us more. A man who relates transactions in which he himself had a share, can scarcely avoid touching upon circumstances and expressing views, which will often convey to the mind of the reader more than suggested itself to that of the writer. That part of these memoirs, which, descending from history to biography, is occupied with the personal adventures of the author, will be read with peculiar pleasure. It possesses all the interest of a romance, and exhibits traits of the character and feelings of the times, which are of much more value than elaborate developements of the intrigues of cabinets or of the plans of campaigns.

The achievements of the rebels in 1745 have been the theme of much vulgar admiration. It has been deemed little else than a species of miracle, that a few thousands of half-armed highlanders should baffle the military power, and shake the throne of the British empire. Here, as in most other cases, our wonder is the fruit of our ignorance. If we look to the actual circumstances of the times, every result will be easily explained.

The only part of the enterprise in which there is any thing that can seem wonderful, is the success with which the first commencement of it was crowned: for the old saying, "*that what is well begun is half ended,*" may be applied with more truth to rebellion than to any thing else. On the 25th of July, Charles Stuart landed in the western highlands with seven followers.

On the 19th of August he was at Glenfinnin with a thousand followers; two days afterwards he received an accession of four hundred men. On the 5th of September he reached Perth; and on the 17th he entered Edinburgh to take possession of the palace of his ancestors. Hitherto there is nothing wonderful in the rapidity of his movements, the prudence of his measures, or the numbers and valour of his followers. The only subject of surprise therefore must be, that the royal army did not prevent so insignificant a band of mountaineers from obtaining possession of the capital of Scotland. But before we blame either the troops or their commanders, let us consider whether they did not do all that, considering their numbers and circumstances, could fairly be expected. It has often been asked, why did they not march immediately to quench the spark of rebellion in its first glimmering? They did so. The intelligence of Charles's landing reached Edinburgh on the 9th of August; and Sir John Cope the commander in chief, in compliance with his own opinions and the advice of the ablest men in Scotland, adopted instantly the resolution of proceeding northwards. But why did he not make more haste? Because the state of the country, and the situation in which he was left by the administration, rendered celerity impossible. He had in the course of the summer repeatedly urged the ministry to put Scotland in a state of defence, but no attention was paid to his communications. Accordingly, when the news of Charles's landing reached Edinburgh, no preparations had been made. Cope had neither troops, nor money, nor provisions. In ten days he could muster only about 1400 men. Though he had written for money on the 3d of August, it was not till the 17th that he received a letter of credit. The poverty of the country which was intended to be the scene of operations, made it necessary to provide sufficient supplies of bread for the army; but though all the biscuits in Leith and Edinburgh were bought up, and the bakers there, as well as in Stirling and Perth, kept in constant employment; he was obliged to begin his march before he could obtain the requisite quantity. He left Stirling on the 11th day after the arrival of the Pretender was known at Edinburgh; and it is not easy to see how Cope, situated as he was, could have used more dispatch, unless he had committed the greatest folly of which a general can be guilty, by taking the field with forces obviously inadequate to the end in view. It would have been easy for him to have begun his march three or four days sooner without money or provisions, but what would have been the advantage of plunging into the midst of the mountains and defiles of the Highlands, with the certainty that to obtain food he must almost immediately have retraced his steps? He took the road towards Fort Augustus, and on the sixth day of

his march he found himself coming close upon the Highlanders. They had taken post at Coryarrak, a mountainous defile, which it was impossible for the bravest troops to force without being exposed to certain destruction. If they had advanced beyond it, or if Cope had been able to get possession of it before them, he might have encountered them with reasonable hopes of success. It was not his fault that they had advanced thus far and no farther; he could not foresee that they would chuse this route, and advance precisely to this point. To go on was impossible; he had therefore only the alternative of retreating or of turning aside. The former of these plans was liable to two objections; it exposed the royal army to the seeming humiliation of not daring to encounter the rebels; and if the country people, whose disaffection there was strong reason to suspect, should break down the bridges, it might be accompanied with considerable danger. To have remained stationary would have been madness, for his provisions would soon have failed; and he had before him an army, which though little more than half of what, according to the intelligence he then had, he supposed it to be, was even in fact more numerous than his own. Cope therefore wisely resolved to turn aside towards Inverness; and consequently the road to Edinburgh was open to the rebels.

As some have blamed Cope for not marching northwards more speedily, so others have condemned him for making any movement in that direction. The Chevalier de Johnstone, after having found fault with him on the former ground, attacks him on the latter too: "By shutting up the Prince in the mountains," says he, "General Cope would have prevented him from performing any of those brilliant achievements, which were so essential in the beginning of his enterprise to ensure its success: and the Prince would never have attempted to pass the Forth by force, had entrenchments, lined with field artillery, been thrown up at all the fords." This scheme, though entertained by wiser heads than Johnstone, and, among others, by some of the ministers for the time, would, in all probability, have terminated in a complete failure. The Forth is fordable in many places, so that it would have been impossible, especially with so small an army as Cope's, to prevent the rebels from passing it. The entrenchments lined with field artillery make a shew in a sentence, but Cope was not fortunate enough to be able to call them into existence. At the time when he began his march there was only one old gunner in the castle of Edinburgh, and three soldiers, belonging to the invalids, who served as matrosses. These, with six gunners, borrowed from the naval service, constituted his corps of artillery in the battle of Preston Pans; we should rather have said *before the battle*, for in the beginning of the action they

ran away with the powder flasks. It is ridiculous to talk of preventing the passage of a fordable river with an army in such a state of equipment.

In the brilliant commencement, therefore, of the Prince's career, there is nothing to excite astonishment—neither superior wisdom, nor distinguished courage, nor even a strange succession of lucky accidents. The only thing that can reasonably occasion a moment's wonder, is the defenceless condition of the country; and even for this it would be unjust to blame the ministers severely. The troops were engaged on foreign service; it was not the fashion of the times to maintain a large standing army for domestic purposes; and though there was reason to apprehend that an attempt might, ere long, be made to restore the house of Stuart, yet wise men might well believe that the means would be proportioned to the ends, and that the preparations of France to escort and aid the Pretender would serve as a signal of the approach of danger, and would give us timely notice to prepare.

By the time that the rebels were in possession of the capital, Cope had returned from the north by sea, and now approached close to Edinburgh. He chose his ground with great judgment:

"The camp of the enemy was fortified by nature, and in the happiest position for so small an army. The general had on his right two inclosures, surrounded by stone-walls, from six to seven feet high, between which there was a road of about twenty feet broad, leading to the village of Preston Pans. Before him was another inclosure, surrounded by a deep ditch filled with water, and from ten to twelve feet broad, which served as a drain to the marshy ground. On his left was a marsh, which terminated in a deep pond; and behind him was the sea: so that he was thus inclosed as in a fortification, which could be attacked in no other manner than by a regular siege. We spent the afternoon in reconnoitering his position: and the more we examined it, the more our uneasiness and chagrin increased, as we saw no possibility of attacking it, without exposing ourselves to be cut to pieces in a disgraceful manner. At sun-set our army traversed the village of Tranent, which was on our right, and took a new position opposite to the marsh. General Cope, at the same time, ordered his army to take a new front, supporting his right by the ditch of the inclosure, and his left by the sea, and having his front towards the lake.

"Mr. Anderson, proprietor of the marsh, came to the Prince in the evening, very *à propos*, to relieve us from our embarrassment. He assured him that there was a place in the marsh where we could pass it with safety, and that he himself had frequently crossed it when hunting. The Prince, having instantly caused the place to be examined, ascertained that this account was correct; and that General Cope, not deeming it passable, had neglected to station a guard

there. He caused the army to pass through the place in question during the night; the Highlanders moving along in files, without meeting with any opposition from the enemy, forming themselves as soon as they came out of the marsh, and extending their line towards the sea.

"At break of day, General Cope took our first line, which was formed in order of battle, at the distance of two hundred paces from his army, for bushes. It consisted of twelve hundred men; and our second line, of six hundred men, was composed of those who were badly armed; many of them, as we have already observed, having only staves or bludgeons in their hands. Captain Macgregor, of the Duke of Perth's regiment, for want of other arms, procured scythes, which he sharpened and fixed to poles of from seven to eight feet long. With these he armed his company, and they proved very destructive weapons.

"When our first line had passed the marsh, Lord George dispatched me to the second line, which the Prince conducted in person, to see that it passed without noise or confusion. Having examined the line, and found that every thing was as it should be, on my return to Lord George, I found the Prince at the head of the column accompanied by Lord Nairn, just as he was beginning to enter the marsh, and I passed it a second time along with him. We were not yet out of the marsh, when the enemy, seeing our first line in order of battle, fired an alarm gun. At the very end of the marsh there was a deep ditch, three or four feet broad, which it was necessary to spring over, and the Prince, in leaping across, fell upon his knees on the other side. I laid hold of his arm, and immediately raised him up. On examining his countenance, it appeared to me that he considered this accident as a bad omen.

"Lord George, at the head of the first line, did not give the English time to recover from their surprise. He advanced with such rapidity that General Cope had hardly time to form his troops in order of battle, when the Highlanders rushed upon them sword in hand. They had been frequently enjoined to aim at the noses of the horses with their swords, without minding the riders; as the natural movement of a horse, wounded in the face, is to wheel round: and a few horses wounded in that manner, are sufficient to throw a whole squadron into disorder, without the possibility of their being afterwards rallied. They followed this advice most implicitly, and the English cavalry was instantly thrown into confusion.

"Macgregor's company did great execution with their scythes. They cut the legs of the horses in two; their riders through the middle of their bodies. Macgregor was brave and intrepid, but, at the same time, altogether whimsical and singular. When advancing to the charge with his company, he received five wounds, two of them from balls that pierced his body through and through. Stretched on the ground, with his head resting on his hand, he called out to the Highlanders of his company, "My lads, I am not dead! —I shall see if any of you does not do his duty!" The Highlanders instantly fell on the flanks of the infantry; which being un-

covered and exposed from the flight of the cavalry, immediately gave way. Thus, in less than five minutes, we obtained a complete victory: with a terrible carnage on the part of the enemy. It was gained with such rapidity, that in the second line, where I still was by the side of the Prince, not having been able to find Lord George, we saw no other enemy on the field of battle than those who were lying on the ground killed and wounded, though we were not more than fifty paces behind our first line, running always as fast as we could to overtake them, and near enough never to lose sight of them. The Highlanders made a terrible slaughter of the enemy, particularly at the spot where the road begins to run between the two inclosures, as it was soon stopped up by the fugitives; as also along the walls of the inclosures, where they killed, without trouble, those who attempted to climb them. The strength of their camp became their destruction. Some of them attempted to rally in the inclosure, where there was an eminence which commanded the field of battle, and from which they fired some shot; but they were soon put to flight by the Highlanders, who immediately entered the inclosure in pursuit of them.

"The field of battle presented a spectacle of horror, being covered with heads, legs, and arms, and mutilated bodies; for the killed all fell by the sword. The enemy had thirteen hundred killed; and we made fifteen hundred prisoners, and took six field-pieces, two mortars, all the tents, baggage, and the military chest. General Cope, by means of a white cockade, which he put in his hat, similar to what we wore, passed through the midst of the Highlanders without being known, and escaped to England, where he carried the first news of his defeat. This victory cost us forty killed, and as many wounded. The greatest advantage which we derived from it was, the reputation which the Prince's army acquired in the outset; which determined many of his partisans who were yet wavering, to declare themselves openly in his favour. The arms of the vanquished, of which we stood in need, were also of great service to us. The Prince slept next night at Pinky-house, about a quarter of a league from the field of battle. He committed to my care one hundred and ten English officers, who were our prisoners, with orders that they should want for nothing.

"The panic-terror of the English surpasses all imagination. They threw down their arms that they might run with more speed, thus depriving themselves by their fears of the only means of arresting the vengeance of the Highlanders. Of so many men in a condition, from their numbers, to preserve order in their retreat, not one thought of defending himself. Terror had taken possession of their minds. I saw a young Highlander, about fourteen years of age, scarcely formed, who was presented to the Prince as a prodigy, having killed, it was said, fourteen of the enemy. The Prince asked him if this was true? "I do not know," replied he, "if I killed them; but, I brought fourteen soldiers to the ground with my sword." Another Highlander brought ten soldiers to the Prince, whom he had made prisoners, driving them before him like a flock of sheep. This High-

lander, from a rashness without example, having pursued a party to some distance from the field of battle, along the road between the two inclosures, struck down the hindmost with a blow of his sword, calling, at the same time, "Down with your arms." The soldiers, terror-struck, threw down their arms without looking behind them, and the Highlander, with a pistol in one hand, and a sword in the other, made them do exactly as he pleased. The rage and despair of these men, on seeing themselves made prisoners by a single individual, may easily be imagined. These were, however, the same English soldiers who had distinguished themselves at Dettingen and Fontenoy, and who might justly be ranked amongst the bravest troops of Europe." (P. 24—30.)

We have quoted this account of the battle of Preston Pans at length, partly because it will serve to correct some of the errors which the vivid delineations in the romance of *Waverley* may have imprinted on the minds of our readers; but still more, because it completely unfolds the cause of the success of the Highlanders. Cope was taken by surprise, and his camp forced in a quarter where it seemed impregnable. The troops could not avail themselves of their superiority in arms and discipline. In a scene of confusion, which annihilated all subordination, and left neither time nor space for military evolutions, the mountaineer was more than equal to the soldier; for he had more confidence in his personal exertions than his adversary—his courage was less dependant on the co-operation of others—and the dirk and sword were more than a match for the musket and bayonet. The mode of fighting practised by the Highlanders is distinctly explained in a subsequent part of the memoirs:

"They advance with rapidity, discharge their pieces when within musket-length of the enemy, and then, throwing them down, draw their swords, and holding a dirk in their left hand with their target, they dart with fury on the enemy, through the smoke of their fire. When within reach of the enemy's bayonets, bending their left knee, they, by their attitude, cover their bodies with their targets, that receive the thrusts of the bayonets, which they contrive to parry, while at the same time they raise their sword-arm, and strike their adversary. Having once got within the bayonets, and into the ranks of the enemy, the soldiers have no longer any means of defending themselves, the fate of the battle is decided in an instant, and the carnage follows; the Highlanders bringing down two men at a time, one with the dirk in the left hand, and another with their sword." (P. 86.)

In the battle of Preston Pans the numbers were nearly equal. Cope had somewhat more than 2,100 men, the rebels about 2,400; of whom upwards of 600, forming the reserve, were not engaged. The author of *Waverley* deviates so far from the fact, as to estimate them at 4,000. It may be worth while to remark, as an illustration of what is of infinite importance both in public and

private affairs—the necessity of habits of accurate thinking to enable a witness to give correct testimony—that, on the trial of Cope, all the officers who were examined fixed the number of rebels in the field at 5000 men or upwards. One individual alone, and that one a Professor of Mathematics, affirmed, that not more than sixteen or eighteen hundred were engaged in the attack. This evidence was treated with contempt, as a vile slander upon the army, and as the silly effusion of science pretending to judge of things with which it had no practical acquaintance. The truth is now known: the Professor of Mathematics judged with perfect accuracy, while the imagination of the military men nearly trebled the actual number of the enemy.

The battle of Preston Pans, or Gladsmuir, gave Charles possession of all Scotland. England remained to be won. For this purpose the army moved from the neighbourhood of Edinburgh on the 3d of November, in three divisions, and on the 9th reached Carlisle. They opened their trenches on the following day, and on the 15th the town and castle surrendered. Marshal Wade with a considerable army was at Newcastle the whole time, but remained without stirring, till the very day of the capitulation. On the 29th of November the rebels reached Manchester, where they were joined by about 300 men, the only partisans whom they found in England willing to shed a drop of blood, or to run the least risk, for the House of Stuart. On the 4th of December they reached Derby. They had now penetrated far into England; they were within less than 130 miles of London, and it is possible that they might have passed the Duke of Cumberland, and placed themselves between him and the capital. But they had not made one step towards the final accomplishment of their object. They had gained no accession of strength; the higher orders stood aloof; the lower classes manifested fear and aversion; the whole power of the government continued unimpaired: a superior army was close by them; another was in their rear; a third awaited them in the vicinity of the capital. In these circumstances it would have been madness to have gone on. What availed four or five thousand men, however brave, against a country like England? Suppose that they had beaten the Duke of Cumberland, their strength would have been too much impaired for them to meet the fresh army which they would have had to encounter immediately afterwards. Even if the royal troops had shrunk back from their path, and Charles had marched triumphantly into the capital, his puny army would have been as nothing amid the immense multitudes of London. The rebels, in marching into England, had done the best thing which men in their situation could do; for they had thus tried every chance of success: but no party in England would take up the sword for

the House of Stuart, and success was consequently hopeless. They had advanced farther, perhaps, than in prudence they ought; constantly flattering themselves that the disappointments of the passing day would be compensated by the events of the morrow. But their eyes must have been gradually opening to the fallacy of their expectations, and at Derby their affairs were brought to a crisis. If they marched onwards they must either fight the Duke of Cumberland or leave him behind them. In either case retreat was thenceforward out of the question: on the latter supposition, because they would have a powerful enemy in their rear; on the former, because it was absurd to fight, except with the design of pressing on at all risks to London. The determination, therefore, to retreat, which was adopted at Derby, was nothing else than the natural result of the reflections which for some time must have been passing through the mind of every chief, who could think as well as hope. Lord George Murray has been accused of causing the adoption of this measure, and of having thus blasted the enterprise of Charles. It was, however, not the retreat that was ruinous to Charles's undertaking, but the circumstances which made retreat indispensable. The Chevalier de Johnstone ascribes the retreat to the arrival of intelligence from Lord John Drummond, who announced, that he had assembled 3,000 men, and that reinforcements were every day expected from France. This circumstance would no doubt have some influence on the resolution of the Highland chiefs, especially as the royal forces were beginning to assemble in considerable numbers in the south of Scotland. It might determine the balance, which in some minds was perhaps wavering between the risk of desperate adventure on the one hand, and the torment of uncertainty and of constantly diminishing hopes on the other. But we can scarcely adopt Johnstone's opinion, that, had it not been for the news of this reinforcement, Lord George Murray would have prosecuted his march to London.

It may be easily imagined, what a grievous mortification the commencement of the retreat proved to the pride and hopes of the Highlanders:

"The retreat was, at length, fixed for the next morning, the 6th of December; and the better to conceal it, we left Derby some hours before day-break. The Highlanders, conceiving at first that they were on their march to attack the army of the Duke of Cumberland, displayed the utmost joy and cheerfulness; but as soon as the day allowed them to see the objects around them, and they found that we were retreating, nothing was to be heard throughout the whole army but expressions of rage and lamentation. If we had been beat the grief could not have been greater." (P. 55.)

Marshal Wade was at Ferry-bridge, when he heard of the

retreat of the rebels. He resolved to march into Lancashire to intercept them, and on the 10th of December arrived at Wakefield, where he learned that they were already at Wigan; he therefore gave up the pursuit. But the Duke of Cumberland followed the retreating army closely, and sent forward a corps of 4000 men, who nearly succeeded in cutting off a strong detachment of the Highlanders, which had charge of the artillery. The detachment repelled all the attacks that were made on it during its march: but towards evening the English troops posted themselves in some enclosures, which commanded the only road by which it could join the main body at Penrith. The rebels, however, at last effected a junction; and the result was a conflict, which, though it bears the name of a skirmish only, was the most severely contested action that occurred in the course of the enterprise. The Duke of Cumberland claimed the victory; but on what pretence, history has never been able to discover; for he failed in his object, was driven from his ground, and lost a much greater number of men than his opponents:

“ The sun was setting when our detachment formed a junction with the army. The Highlanders immediately ran to the inclosures where the English were, fell down on their knees, and began to cut down the thorn hedges with their dirks; a necessary precaution, as they wore no breeches, but only a sort of petticoat, which reached to their knees. During this operation, they received the fire of the English with the most admirable firmness and constancy; and, as soon as the hedge was cut down, they jumped into the inclosures, sword in hand, and, with an inconceivable intrepidity, broke the English battalions, who suffered so much the more as they did not turn their backs, as at the battle of Gladsmuir, but allowed themselves to be cut to pieces without quitting their ground. Platoons of forty and fifty men might be seen falling all at once under the swords of the Highlanders; yet they still remained firm, and closed up their ranks, as soon as an opening was made through them by the sword. At length, however, the Highlanders forced them to give way, and pursued them across three inclosures, to a heath, which lay behind them. The only prisoner they took was the Duke of Cumberland's footman, who declared that his master would have been killed, if the pistol, with which a Highlander took aim at his head, had not missed fire. The Prince had the politeness to send him back instantly to his master. We could not ascertain the loss of the English, in this affair, which some estimated as high as six hundred men. We only lost a dozen Highlanders; who after traversing the inclosures, continued the pursuit with too much ardour along the heath.” (P. 61.)

On the morning of the 19th of December they arrived at Carlisle, having marched 170 miles in thirteen days and a half; and on the following day, they re-entered Scotland. On the 20th of December they reached Glasgow, and allowed themselves six

days repose. Hence they proceeded to the neighbourhood of Stirling, where they were joined by reinforcements till their numbers amounted to upwards of 4,000 men. On the 4th of January they began to form the siege of Stirling Castle. In the mean time General Hawley had entered Scotland, and with 8,000 regular troops, besides volunteers, had taken post at Falkirk. On the 17th the rebels unexpectedly marched thither and gave him battle:

“General Hawley drew up his army in order of battle, in two lines, having three regiments of infantry in a hollow at the foot of the hill. His cavalry was placed, before his infantry, on the left wing of the first line. The English began the attack, with a body of about eleven hundred cavalry, who advanced very slowly against the right of our army, and did not halt till they were within twenty paces of our first line, to induce us to fire. The Highlanders, who had been particularly enjoined not to fire till the army was within musket-length of them, the moment the cavalry halted discharged their muskets, and killed about eighty men, each of them having aimed at a rider. The commander of this body of cavalry, who had advanced some paces before his men, was of the number. The cavalry closing their ranks, which were opened by our discharge, put spurs to their horses, and rushed upon the Highlanders at a hard trot, breaking their ranks, throwing down every thing before them, and trampling the Highlanders under the feet of their horses. The most singular and extraordinary combat immediately followed. The Highlanders, stretched on the ground, thrust their dirks into the bellies of the horses. Some seized the riders by their clothes, dragged them down, and stabbed them with their dirks; several again used their pistols; but few of them had sufficient space to handle their swords. Macdonald of Clanranald, chief of one of the clans of the Macdonalds, assured me, that whilst he was lying upon the ground, under a dead horse, which had fallen upon him, without the power of extricating himself, he saw a dismounted horseman struggling with a Highlander: fortunately for him, the Highlander, being the strongest, threw his antagonist, and having killed him with his dirk, he came to his assistance, and drew him with difficulty from under his horse.

“The resistance of the Highlanders was so incredibly obstinate, that the English, after having been for some time engaged pell-mell with them in their ranks, were at length repulsed, and forced to retire. The Highlanders did not neglect the advantage they had obtained, but pursued them keenly with their swords, running as fast as their horses, and not allowing them a moment's time to recover from their flight. So that the English cavalry falling back on their own infantry, drawn up in order of battle behind them, threw them immediately into disorder, and carried the right wing of their army with them in their flight. The clan of Camerons, which was on the left of our army, having attacked at the same time the right of the English army, where there were only infantry, put it also to flight.” (P. 92—94.)

The rout thus begun was prevented from becoming universal by three regiments on Hawley's right wing, who, maintaining their ground, checked the pursuit, and by the negligence of those, who commanded the Highland left, in improving the advantage which had been gained on the other parts of the line. Though the victory was so complete as to be followed by the almost total dispersion of the royal army and the loss of their cannon, the Highlanders were for some time not aware of the success which had attended their arms. It was only by accident, that Lord Kilmarnock, who, as his estate lay in the neighbourhood, was well acquainted with the country, approaching by bye paths to reconnoitre the enemy, discovered that they were in full flight, and communicated the joyful intelligence to Charles. So little did military conduct or regularity prevail among the victors, that many hours elapsed, before even the superior officers knew whether they had lost or won. Our author took shelter in a mansion where he found the brother of the Duke of Gordon, the son of Lord Lovat, and six or seven other chiefs of clans: "*None of them,*" says he, "*knew what had become of their regiments; other officers arrived every instant, all equally ignorant of the fate of the battle.*" It was not till eight in the evening that their suspense was terminated.

The rebels had now to choose between two methods of proceeding. They might return to prosecute the siege of Stirling Castle; or they might march to Edinburgh, disperse the few royal troops that still kept together, and by that means either prevent the Duke of Cumberland from entering Scotland, or at least diminish the force which he would be able to bring into the field against them. The latter was both the safer and the more brilliant path. It may therefore seem wonderful that they should have preferred to continue their attack on Stirling Castle, though it was easy to foresee, that before they could bring the siege to a conclusion, a royal army would be assembled too strong for them to resist. To account for their conduct, we must recollect that their numbers were greatly diminished after the battle of Falkirk; for about 4,000 men, under one pretence or another, went off to visit their homes. Lord George Murray was probably aware that, with the forces which he could muster, he had no chance of maintaining his ground in the low country. Had he marched towards Edinburgh, the enemy would have fallen back, till they had collected a force sufficient to compel him to retrace his steps, without having derived any advantage whatsoever from his previous movements, and with all the seeming disgrace and real danger which accompany a retreat. He might therefore think it, on the whole, advisable to remain in the neighbourhood of Stirling, and it was better in the mean time to

prosecute the siege than to remain totally inactive. There was always some chance of success: and the French engineer, in whom it was natural that the Highland chiefs should confide, was bold in his promises and sanguine in his expectations. This engineer, however, was utterly ignorant of his art. He was suffered to construct his battery in quiet; but it was scarcely finished, when it was destroyed by the fire of the castle. All hopes of reducing the fortress were now at an end; the royal troops were assembling in considerable force; the Duke of Cumberland had arrived at Edinburgh; and accordingly, on the last day of January, the rebels left Stirling and directed their march towards Inverness. On the 16th of February they had arrived at Moy, about ten or eleven miles from Inverness, and the Prince had there taken up his abode in the mansion of the chief of the clan of Mackintosh. Lord Loudon was at Inverness with a considerable body of troops, and formed a design for seizing the person of Charles, in which he very nearly succeeded. The adventure is narrated by Johnstone more circumstantially than by any preceding writer:

“ His Lordship, at three o'clock in the afternoon, posted guards, and a chain of sentinels, all round Inverness, both within and without the town, with positive orders not to suffer any person to leave it, on any pretext whatever, or whatever the rank of the person might be. He ordered, at the same time, fifteen hundred men to hold themselves in readiness to march at a moment's warning; and having assembled this body of troops without noise, and without alarming the inhabitants, he put himself at their head, and instantly set off, planning his march so as to arrive at the castle of Moy about eleven o'clock at night.

“ Whilst some English officers were drinking in the house of Mrs. Bailly, an innkeeper in Inverness, and passing the time till the hour of their departure, her daughter, a girl of thirteen or fourteen years of age, who happened to wait on them, paid great attention to their conversation, and from certain expressions dropped by them, she discovered their designs. As soon as this generous girl was certain as to their intentions, she immediately left the house, escaped from the town, notwithstanding the vigilance of the centinels, and immediately took the road to Moy, running as fast as she was able, without shoes or stockings, which to accelerate her progress, she had taken off, in order to inform the Prince of the danger that menaced him. She reached Moy, quite out of breath, before Lord Loudon; and the Prince, with difficulty, escaped in his robe de chambre, night cap, and slippers, to the neighbouring mountains, where he passed the night in concealment. This dear girl, to whom the Prince owed his life, was in great danger of losing her own, from her excessive fatigue on this occasion; but the care and attention she experienced restored her to life, and her health was at length re-es-

tablished. The Prince, having no suspicion of such a daring attempt, had very few people with him in the castle of Moy.

"As soon as the girl had spread the alarm, the blacksmith of the village of Moy presented himself to the Prince, and assured His Royal Highness that he had no occasion to leave the castle; as he would answer for it, with his head, that Lord Loudon and his troops would be obliged to return faster than they came. The Prince had not sufficient confidence in his assurances to neglect seeking his safety by flight to the neighbouring mountains. However, the blacksmith, for his own satisfaction, put his project in execution. He instantly assembled a dozen of his companions, and advanced with them about a quarter of a league from the castle, on the road to Inverness. There he laid an ambuscade, placing six of his companions, on each side of the highway, to wait the arrival of the detachment of Lord Loudon, enjoining them not to fire till he should tell them, and then not to fire together, but one after another. When the head of the detachment of Lord Loudon was opposite the twelve men, about eleven o'clock in the evening, the blacksmith called out with a loud voice, "Here come the villains, who intend carrying off our Prince; fire, my lads, do not spare them; give no quarter!" In an instant muskets were discharged from each side of the road, and the detachment, seeing their project had taken wind, began to fly in the greatest disorder, imagining that our whole army was lying in wait for them. Such was their terror and consternation, that they did not stop till they reached Inverness. In this manner did a common blacksmith, with twelve of his companions, put Lord Loudon and fifteen hundred regular troops to flight. The fifer of his Lordship, who happened to be at the head of the detachment, was killed by the first discharge; and the detachment did not wait for a second." (P. 110—112.)

The Duke of Cumberland now advanced into the Highlands. He sent detachments to inflict severities on the relations and dependents of those who had engaged in the rebellion; and in particular dispatched a body of troops into the district of the Duke of Athol, whose brother, at the head of the vassals of the family, directed the councils and commanded the army of Charles. Lord George Murray, as soon as he heard of this proceeding, hastened with his clansmen to Athol, where in one night he surprised thirty posts, and put to the sword or took prisoners all the royal troops in the district, with the exception of two or three hundred who defended themselves in the castle. After this exploit he remained fourteen days in the neighbourhood, though, strange to say! six thousand Hessians were all the time within a day's march of him. A satisfactory reason for a circumstance which is in itself extraordinary, and which has not been hitherto explained, is assigned by Johnstone. Some Hessians, who had been sent into Athol to support the English detachment, were routed by the Highlanders, and a Lieutenant was made prisoner.

Next day the officer was sent back with a letter, in which Lord George demanded from the Prince of Hesse a cartel for the exchange of prisoners, threatening, if his proposal was not accepted, to put every Hessian who fell into his hands to the sword. The Prince thought the demand reasonable; but as the Duke of Cumberland would not permit him to accede to it, he declared that he would not combat with men driven to despair, and that without a cartel no Hessian should stir from Perth. It was from this cause, that Lord George was enabled to carry on his operations without molestation.

While the main body of the rebels lay at Inverness, the Duke of Cumberland had distributed his troops in the neighbourhood of Aberdeen. On the 8th of April he deemed the season sufficiently advanced to permit him to move northwards. On the 13th, Charles, alarmed by the approach of his adversary, who, contrary to universal expectation, had crossed the Spey without opposition, moved out of Inverness, and posted his army at a small distance from it. The 15th was the anniversary of the Duke of Cumberland's birth; in consequence of the celebration of which, his troops, it was supposed, would be buried in sleep and intoxication. A plan was accordingly formed to surprise the royal camp during the night. But the Highlanders, who had separated themselves in quest of food, could not be assembled by the appointed hour, and accidents occurred to retard their march, so that when they came within two or three miles of the English camp, the day was too high to allow them to carry their original plan into effect. They therefore turned aside, and about seven in the morning arrived at Culloden. The Duke advanced towards them. It was easy for them to have taken post on some strong ground which was not far off; and if, either from want of provisions, or from any other cause, they should have been unable to maintain themselves there, to have withdrawn into the mountains, and carried on a hill campaign. But Inverness would have been abandoned, and the mountain warfare would have been very fatiguing to some of the individuals, who were immediately attached to the personal service of the Prince, and had most influence over him. For these two reasons the resolution was taken, contrary to the opinion of the ablest among the chiefs, to give battle to the royal army. Never did men fight under greater disadvantages. They had been exposed to considerable fatigue and privations during the two preceding days: they had been marching all night; they had been twenty-four hours without food; and their numbers did not exceed 5,000.

My opponent was fresh and unexhausted, and in respect of numbers was nearly twice as strong as they were; for the Duke of Cumberland had with him 8,000 regulars, besides

a part of Lord Loudon's regiment, and a numerous militia from Argyleshire, who did him most effectual service. Men, however, are very prone to be deluded by the suggestions of their own narrow experience; and the success which had attended the arms of the Highlanders in all their previous conflicts, probably inspired many with a delusive hope that victory would still smile upon them. The result taught them a different lesson. Their centre had broken the first line of the enemy, their left was advancing rapidly to the charge, when the royal troops, getting possession of an enclosure, attacked their right wing in flank, and threw it into confusion. The disorder immediately became general, and ended in a total rout. The Highlanders, however, did not sustain any considerable loss; and on the second day afterwards, they had assembled at Ruthven in as great force as they were at Culloden, and with the certainty of being soon much more formidable. The chiefs of the clans were present; all who had gone to visit their homes were hastening to the standard of Charles; and many, who had hitherto remained inactive, were now expected to join heartily in the cause, in order to save their country from becoming the prey of the Duke of Cumberland. Lord George Murray wrote to Charles, to inform him that in a few days he would be at the head of a greater army than had ever yet obeyed his commands. But Charles did not possess that steadiness of mind which could defy the frowns of fortune. His own despondency, or the fears of the timid counsellors who possessed his confidence, made him look upon further efforts as unavailing; and the only answer which he deigned to return to men who had hazarded life, high rank, and ample fortune for his sake, was "*Let every man seek his safety in the best way he can.*" It was a scene, which, at the commencement of the enterprize, could scarcely have been anticipated—a candidate for a crown abandoning his partisans, who with arms in their hands were imploring him not to desist from the struggle, and still to try the chances of war. But Charles could not be moved from his purpose: the chiefs bade each other a mournful adieu, and the Highlanders in wild howlings gave vent to their grief and their fears.

Such was the termination of this enterprize—begun with only seven men, and abandoned when as many thousands were in arms to support it. Though Charles despaired too soon, his quick abandonment of his project, was fortunate for his own partisans, as well as for the country at large. The continuance of the war would have brought upon the Highlands much greater sufferings than what they had actually to endure, while it afforded an chance of raising the House of Stuart to the throne. More battles might have been fought, more blood might have been

shed, more instances might have been given of the devotion of the Highland clans to the cause which they had espoused. But that cause could never triumph. There were three circumstances which rendered its final success impossible. The first was, the hatred which some of the Highland clans bore to the House of Stuart. The enmity of the Campbells, for instance, founded on deep and bloody wrongs, was fatal to the exiled family, not only by the strength which it directly subtracted from their scale to throw into that of their adversary, but likewise by overawing inferior and neighbouring clans, whom their own inclinations would have urged to support the descendants of their ancient sovereigns. The second was, the enmity of the presbyterians to the House of Stuart. Throughout the whole of the Lowlands of Scotland, containing five-sevenths of the population, and nearly all the wealth of the country, the inhabitants were in general inveterate foes to the exiled family; and in this sentiment of enmity the members of the established church were, if possible, surpassed by the seceders. Numerous proofs of the popular zeal might be adduced. Glasgow raised a regiment of volunteers to support the royal cause. "In the country I had to pass through," says Johnstone, speaking of the dangers which he encountered after the battle of Culloden, "all the peasants were fanatical Calvinists, and assembled of themselves with their ministers at their head, to go out on expeditions to take such unfortunate gentlemen prisoners, as made their escape from the Highlands and the pursuits of the soldiers." In another place he says, "The fanatical zeal of the peasantry was an evil still greater than that of the soldiers; and the towns and villages I had to pass through, were all filled with Calvinists, bitter enemies of the House of Stuart." Charles therefore could derive no strength from the Lowlands of Scotland: his influence there was bounded by the extent of his military power. He would be obeyed only so far as he could compel obedience, but not an iota further. The third and most important of the circumstances which decided the fate of Charles's undertaking, was the indifference of the people of England to his family. The Stuarts had no partisans among the great body of the nation. The people, without feeling any peculiar predilection for the House of Brunswick, were satisfied with the existing government, and had no wish to change it for that of the Stuarts; and though they had not that rancorous hatred of the exiled family which prevailed among the Scotch presbyterians, they regarded Charles's army with the fear and dislike which it was natural that strangers should excite.

"Our stragglers seldom failed to be attacked by the English peasants, who were all implacable enemies of the Prince, but too

cowardly to dare to take up arms against us, though the different provinces through which we passed, might have easily formed an army of a hundred thousand men to oppose us. They were deficient neither in hatred toward us, nor in the wish to injure us; but they wanted courage and resolution to expose themselves to the swords of the Highlanders.

"The terror of the English was truly inconceivable, and in many cases they seemed quite bereft of their senses. One evening, Mr. Cameron of Lochiel entered the lodgings assigned to him, his landlady, an old woman, threw herself at his feet, and, with uplifted hands, and tears in her eyes, supplicated him to take her life, but to spare her two little children. He asked her if she was in her senses, and told her to explain herself; when she answered that every body said the Highlanders ate children, and made them their common food. Mr. Cameron having assured her that they would not injure either her or her little children, or any person whatever, she looked at him for some moments with an air of surprise, and then opened a press, calling out with a loud voice, 'Come out, children; the gentleman will not eat you.' The children immediately left the press where she had concealed them, and threw themselves at his feet.

"They affirmed in the newspapers of London, that we had dogs in our army trained to fight; and that we were indebted, for our victory at Gladsmuir, to these dogs, who darted with fury on the English army. They represented the Highlanders as monsters, with claws instead of hands. In a word, they never ceased to circulate, every day, the most extravagant and ridiculous stories with respect to the Highlanders." (P. 76—77.)

With the support of only a part of the Highland clans, while some of the most powerful among them, and the whole population of the Lowlands of Scotland, were his determined foes, and aversion, rather than partiality to his cause, prevailed among the people of England, how was it possible that Charles should finally succeed? How could the bravery and devotion of a few thousands of half-armed Highlanders crush the whole military force of the empire, and triumph over the determined resistance of one part of the people, and the dislike and aversion of the other? It is true that many of the great families of England wished well to the rebels, and had even pledged themselves to support the enterprise. But they were not aware of the true state of public feeling, till events revealed to them, that the prejudices which had been transmitted to them as a species of family heir-looms, had little influence on the country at large. Abstract notions of hereditary right, and a vain pride in adhering to the party which their ancestors had supported, were the only motives which could impel the gentry to take the field; and these motives were of a nature with which the country was little disposed to sympathise. The great Jacobite families perceived, that, though they should array themselves against the existing government, their

example would not be generally followed. They saw that there was no powerful feeling in the minds of their fellow citizens, waiting to be put in action by a few men of rank and consequence, in order that it might break forth and carry every thing before it. They might join the standard of Charles, but would the farmers and manufacturers of England have done the same? The respect paid to the gentry and nobility gives the upper classes immense weight, when they act either in support of established authority, or in concurrence with strong popular passion: but it is sluggish and inert when opposed by general feeling, and by reverence for the government and the laws. In Scotland, where the landed proprietors had more influence than in the southern parts of the island, many of the Lowland nobility joined the rebels; yet the accession of strength, which Charles derived from the Lowlands of Scotland, is too trifling to be mentioned. The aid of the Jacobite nobility of England would have been equally inefficient. They might have graced his fall with the splendour of their names, and, followed by a few of their immediate dependants, might have made a small addition to the amount of his forces; but the general spirit of the nation would have remained unaltered. It was only by means of the nation that the Stuarts could triumph. They had the support of a part of the Highlands, but all the rest of the kingdom was either decidedly hostile or indifferent to them. In such circumstances success was impossible. It is to this cause, and not to any errors in the mode of conducting the enterprise, that its failure must be ascribed. Such errors might vary the time and mode of the final catastrophe; but the catastrophe itself was certain, as certain at least as any thing in human affairs can be.

Johnstone in different parts of his memoirs ascribes the failure of the rebellion to different causes. He thinks, for instance, that Charles ought to have been accompanied by officers distinguished for their talents in the art of war. It may reasonably be doubted, whether such officers would not have done more harm than good. Highlanders could be commanded only by Highland chieftains, Lord George Murray probably served Charles better than Marshal Saxe himself could have done. He is of opinion, also, that he should have remained in Scotland, and established himself firmly there, before he ventured to cross the Tweed. Was this plan fitted to increase the number of his adherents, or to enlarge his resources? Would men have been more eager to join him, when they saw him remain tranquil at Edinburgh, while the whole might of England hovered on the frontier, than when in the full career of victory, he planted his standard on the walls of Carlisle, and marched triumphantly to Derby? As to the scheme of annulling the union with England, it is too wild to be

reasoned against. Strong connexions of private interest had gradually sprung up which bound the northern and southern parts of the island indissolubly together; and if Charles had attempted to separate them, he would have stirred up dissensions and excited opposition, which would have effectually checked his progress.

The retreat from Derby is often mentioned as a fatal mistake. We have already seen that it was a measure of necessity. So also the rebels have been often blamed for not improving sufficiently the victory of Falkirk. The remarks which we have already made on that subject, induce us to doubt, whether they did not improve it as far as circumstances would permit. The battle of Culloden was beyond all doubt an error; and the refusal of Charles to join his adherents at Ruthven with a view to continue the war, was the least politic as well as the least spirited plan, which he could have adopted. But these events only hastened the termination of the war. From the moment that Charles was cooped up in the Highlands, though he might have maintained for some time defensive hostilities, even the most sanguine of his adherents could scarcely hope for success.

We here take leave of the historical part of the work; we have not entered into any details concerning the errors, frequently of a very gross nature, with which the work abounds. As instances, we may refer to the share which is ascribed to Marshal Wade in the pursuit of the rebels on their retreat from Derby, to the account of the Duke of Cumberland's conduct upon the surrender of Carlisle, and to the history of the operations against Lord Loudon after the arrival of Charles at Inverness. The mistakes in dates are endless. But though the Chevalier de Johnstone cannot claim much praise for his accuracy, it would be useless for us to expatiate on this defect; for his errors are pointed out and corrected in the excellent notes, which his editor and translator has subjoined to the work. These notes do more than prevent the reader from being led astray by the mis-statements of Johnstone: they frequently bring together all the information which the mind must have before it in forming a judgment concerning a particular transaction; so that the memoirs, however imperfect in themselves, taken in conjunction with the notes, convey more accurate notions concerning the Rebellion of 1745, than are to be found anywhere else.

On one subject, however, the prejudices of the editor coincide too much with those of the Chevalier de Johnstone: we mean the character of Charles. Without ascribing to him those high heroic qualities with which some imaginations have invested him, and putting out of the question what we are told of him in after life on very suspicious authority, we can find in his conduct

during this expedition nothing to disapprove of, unless we blame him for throwing away the sword immediately after the battle of Culloden. Our author insinuates, and his editor too, that Charles was deficient in personal courage, but nothing appears to warrant the charge. From the mode of fighting practised by the Highlanders, it would have been absurd for him to have advanced at their head; there were others who could perform that duty better than he, and we find no case in which he kept out of the way of danger, when the general good would have required him to expose his person more freely. Johnstone says, that during the battle of Culloden Charles by messengers repeatedly, though ineffectually, desired Lord George Murray to send troops to keep possession of an enclosure on the right of their army, and that when he saw his orders neglected, he ought to have put himself at the head of his forces and executed in person a manœuvre which was necessary for the general safety. Let it be remembered, however, that Johnstone was in the left wing, and consequently could not have been an eye-witness of what he relates,—that Lord George Murray was probably a better judge than any other person of the number of men that could be spared for the defence of the enclosure, and that nothing could have been more absurd than for Charles, in the very heat of the action, to have interfered with the arrangements of those, into whose hands the direction of every thing had been put. He had to deal with fiery spirits; and to have passed through so many adventures without displeasing any of his adherents is no small praise. His desertion of his friends after the defeat at Culloden may be blamed, yet let us not forget that his conduct on that occasion admits of several interpretations. It *may* have proceeded from pusillanimity, but it may also have proceeded from deference to the opinions of those to whom from his youth he had been accustomed to look with respect, or even from humanity. As final success was clearly hopeless, he might well say to himself, that it was needless to prolong the struggle with a great waste of blood, when no ultimate benefit could be expected from it: though he had landed with only seven men, he then hoped to find partisans in every quarter of the kingdom; he might still place himself at the head of seven thousand men, but he had now learned that these were all who would unsheathe the sword in his defence. It is therefore ridiculous to allege, as Johnstone does, that he abandoned his enterprise, when circumstances were more auspicious to him than at its commencement.

The latter half of this book contains an account of the author's personal adventures after the battle of Culloden, and is extremely interesting. His escape from the field of battle is narrated with a curious simplicity; the gravity with which he blames a poor

fellow, for his unwillingness to resign a horse to him is almost absurd.

"Being no longer able to keep myself on my legs, and the enemy always advancing very slowly, but redoubling their fire, my mind was agitated and undecided whether I should throw away my life, or surrender a prisoner, which was a thousand times worse than death on the field of battle. All at once I perceived a horse, about thirty paces before me, without a rider. The idea of being yet able to escape, gave me fresh strength, and served as a spur to me. I ran and laid hold of the bridle, which was fast in the hand of a man lying on the ground, whom I supposed dead; but, what was my surprise, when the cowardly poltroon, who was suffering from nothing but fear, dared to remain in the most horrible fire to dispute the horse with me, at twenty paces from the enemy? All my menaces could not induce him to quit the bridle. Whilst we were disputing, a discharge from a cannon, loaded with grape-shot, fell at our feet, and covered us with mud, without, however, producing any effect upon this singular individual, who obstinately persisted in retaining the horse. Fortunately for me, Finlay Cameron, an officer in Lochiel's regiment, a youth of twenty years of age, six feet high, and very strong and vigorous, happened to pass near us. I called on him to assist me. "Ah! Finlay," said I, "this fellow will not give me up the horse." Finlay flew to me like lightning, immediately presented his pistol to the head of this man, and threatened to blow out his brains if he hesitated a moment to let go the bridle. The fellow, who had the appearance of a servant, at length yielded, and took to his heels. Having obtained the horse, I attempted to mount him several times; but all my efforts were ineffectual, as I was without strength and completely exhausted. I called again on poor Finlay, though he was already some paces from me, to assist me to mount. He returned, took me in his arms, with as much ease as if I had been a child, and threw me on the horse like a loaded sack, giving the horse at the same time a heavy blow to make him set off with me. Then, wishing that I might have the good fortune to make my escape, he bounded off like a roc, and was in a moment out of sight. We were hardly more than fifteen or twenty paces from the enemy when he quitted me. As soon as I found myself at the distance of thirty or forty paces, I endeavoured to set myself right on the horse, put my feet in the stirrups, and rode off as fast as the wretched animal could carry me." (P. 160, 161.)

After the clans broke up at Ruthven, the Chevalier de Johnstone went first to the house of Mr. Gordon of Killyhuntley. Mrs. Gordon offered to cause a hut to be constructed for him in one of the most secret recesses of the adjacent mountains, which she would store with provisions and books, and where, in the disguise of a shepherd tending a few sheep, he might remain with safety. Though the lady added to the allurements of the proposal by promising to visit her shepherd occasionally, he could

not brook the idea of remaining in a state of suspense as to his final destiny. Exchanging therefore his dress for a labourer's rags, of the pestilential odour of which he complains vehemently, he repaired to Banff, where his brother-in-law held a situation under government, which gave him the means of facilitating his friend's escape. Though the town and neighbourhood was zealously attached to the family of Hanover, protected by his disguise he completed the journey in safety, and was kindly sheltered in the house of an acquaintance, where he had an interview with his relation. That relation, however, was too prudent to expose himself to danger for the sake of another, though his father Lord Rollo had taken arms in the former rebellion, and had been prevented only by old age from following the same course again. Our Chevalier, disappointed in this hope, had now two plans before him. He might lurk in the highlands, or he might make the best of his way to Edinburgh, where his friends would conceal him till an opportunity of escape was found. He knew no person in the highlands, he therefore chose the latter alternative, the dangers of which, though more threatening in appearance, were perhaps less real than those of the other scheme. They consisted chiefly in the difficulty of passing the friths of Tay and of Forth: for numerous bodies of cavalry, who constantly patrolled the shores of these two arms of the sea, arrested all who had no passports; and the most severe penalties were denounced against all, who assisted a rebel either in concealing himself or in finding the means of crossing to the other side. In his disguise, and with the aid of Mr. Gordon of Kildrummie, to whom he was an entire stranger, he reached Cortachie.

"As most of the vassals of Lord Ogilvie had been in the army of Prince Charles, I ran no risk in applying to the people of the first house in Cortachie which I came to. Having entered a public house, and informed the lady that I belonged to the army of the Prince, she immediately told me that two of our gentlemen were concealed in Glen-Prossen, a large ravine between two mountains, at the bottom of which there is a small rivulet. This Glen lies at the foot of the mountains, and is a most picturesque and retired spot. Having enquired my way to them, and received the necessary directions, I proceeded immediately to the house of a peasant, named Samuel, who dwelt at the head of the Glen, about half a league from Cortachie, where I found the two gentlemen in question." (P. 184, 185.)

"Samuel was a very honest man, but extremely poor. We remained seventeen days in his house, eating at the same table with himself and his family, who had no other food than oatmeal, and no other drink than the water of the stream, which ran through the glen. We breakfasted every morning on a piece of oatmeal bread, which we were enabled to swallow by draughts of water; for dinner

we bléid oatmeal with water, till it acquired a consistency, and we eat it with horn spoons; in the evening we poured boiling water on this meal in a dish, for our supper. I must own, that the time, during which I was confined to this diet, appeared to pass very slowly, though none of us seemed to suffer in our health from it; on the contrary, we were all exceedingly well. We might have had some addition to our sorry cheer, by sending for it to Cortachie; but we were afraid, (as Samuel's mode of living was well known, and as any alteration in it would lead to a suspicion that people were concealed in his house,) lest some ill-disposed person should give information of the circumstance to one of the numerous cavalry detachments, that passed through Cortachie, which would lead to our being made prisoners." (P. 186.)

"Besides the poverty of our fare, to which I had a good deal of difficulty to accustom myself, we were frequently alarmed by detachments of English cavalry, making their appearance in our neighbourhood. Samuel had a married daughter, who lived at the entrance into the glen, and she served as a sentinel, to inform us when there were any English detachments at Cortachie. This tranquilized us during the day, for our sentinel was very exact in acquainting us with every thing that passed: but when the troops arrived in the evening, we were obliged to consult our safety by escaping to the neighbouring mountains, where we frequently passed nights in the open air, even during dreadful tempests of wind and rain." (P. 188.)

This lurking-place soon became unsafe, his two comrades bent their steps towards the highlands, but our chevalier, though he had resolved to accompany them, was brought back by a dream to his first purpose of proceeding to Edinburgh. When he arrived at the frith of Tay, the good offices of a gentleman in the neighbourhood, to whom he revealed his situation, procured him a boat in which he was to pass to the other shore during the night; but ere the appointed hour arrived, the boatmen were so terrified by the menaces of some soldiers, who had been searching the village, that they refused to fulfil their engagement. This intelligence was a terrible disappointment to him; he resolved, at whatever risk, to go to the village in person, and use his endeavours to persuade the boatmen to assist him in his distress.

"As soon as I entered the public-house, the landlady, who was called Mrs. Burn, whispered in my ear that I had nothing to fear in her house, as her own son had been in our army with Lord Ogilvie: this I considered as a very good omen. She immediately pointed out to me the boatmen who had promised to Mr. Graham to transport me to the other side of the Frith. I applied to them immediately, but found them trembling and alarmed at the threats of the soldiers. All my offers, my prayers, and solicitations were of no avail; and, having employed half an hour in endeavouring to persuade them, to no purpose, I perceived that the two daughters of Mrs. Burn, who were as beautiful as Venus, and the eldest of whom was hardly

eighteen, were not objects of indifference to the boatmen, from the glances they bestowed upon them from time to time. I therefore quitted the stupid boatmen and attached myself to these two pretty girls, with the view of gaining them over to my interest, and availing myself of their influence with the boatmen, as a mistress is naturally all-powerful with her lover. I caressed them, I embraced them, the one after the other, and said a thousand flattering and agreeable things to them. Indeed, it cost me very little to act this part, for they were exceedingly beautiful; and the compliments I paid them were sincere, and flowed from the heart. As I had resolved to sleep at Mrs. Burn's, in case I did not succeed in crossing the Frith, I dismissed the old woman.

"In less than half an hour my two beauties were entirely in my interest, and each of them made a vigorous assault on her sweet-heart, making use of all manner of prayers and intreaties, but with as little success as I had had. The fear of these stupid animals was more powerful than their love. The beautiful and charming Mally Burn, the eldest of the two, disgusted, at length, and indignant at their obstinacy, said to her sister, "O, Jenny! they are despicable cowards and poltroons. I would not for the world that this unfortunate gentleman was taken in our house. I pity his situation. Will you take an oar? I shall take another, and we will row him over ourselves, to the eternal shame of these pitiful and heartless cowards." Jenny consented without hesitation. I clasped them in my arms, and covered them, by turns, with a thousand tender kisses.

"I thought, at first, that the generous resolution of these girls would operate upon their lovers; but the unfeeling cowards were not in the least moved. They preserved their phlegm, and allowed the charming girls to act as they pleased, without being in the smallest degree affected by their conduct. Seeing the obstinacy of the boatmen, and wishing to take advantage of the offer of my female friends, I immediately took the two oars on my shoulders, and proceeded to the shore, accompanied by my two beauties. I launched the boat, and, as soon as we had all three entered, I pushed it into deep water, and taking one of the oars myself, I gave the other to one of the girls, who was to be relieved by the other, when she found herself fatigued. I experienced, on this occasion, the truth of the maxim, that every kind of knowledge may be useful. While I was in Russia, where parties of pleasure on the water are frequent, I used sometimes to amuse myself with rowing; little thinking then that I should one day be obliged to row for my life.

"We left Broughty at ten o'clock in the evening, and reached the opposite shore of this arm of the sea, which is about two miles in breadth, near midnight. The weather was fine, and the night was sufficiently clear, from the light of the stars, to enable me to distinguish the roads. My two beauties landed with me, to put me in the highway that leads to St. Andrews; and I took leave of them, deeply affected with their generous sentiments and heroic courage, experiencing a sensible regret on quitting them, when I thought that perhaps I should never see them more. I embraced them a thousand

times by turns, and as they would not consent to receive any pecuniary gratification, I contrived to slip ten or twelve shillings into the pocket of the charming Mally, who was one of the most perfect beauties nature ever formed, with an elegant shape, and possessed of all the graces of her sex. Under any other circumstances, they would have tempted me to prolong my stay in the village; and if fortune had ever permitted me to return to my native country, I should certainly have gone to Broughty, for the express purpose of visiting them." (P. 202—205.)

He now bent his course towards St. Andrews; it was not in the direct route to Edinburgh, but it was the only place where he had any friend from whom he could look for aid. He there applied to an old lady, a distant relation of his own; her religion (she was a catholic) made her house an unsafe place of refuge, especially in a town distinguished for calvinistic zeal. She therefore immediately sent him to a farmer, who rented land from her close to the town, with a letter, in which she required him to furnish the bearer with a horse and guide to conduct him to Edinburgh, whither he was going with important papers relating to a law suit, in which she was engaged. Unfortunately it was Sunday, and the pious scruples of the farmer occasioned an unexpected difficulty.

"I delivered the letter to the farmer, and the answer I received from this brute petrified me. "Mrs. Spence," said he, "may take her farm from me and give it to whom she pleases; but she cannot make me profane the Lord's day, by giving my horse to one who means to travel upon the sabbath." I represented to him, with all the energy of which I was master, the necessity of having his horse, on account of the law-suit of Mrs. Spence, and the great loss with which any delay in transmitting her papers to her advocate might be attended; but all that I could urge had no effect upon him, and he obstinately persisted in his refusal." (P. 209.)

Johnstone was now in a most distressed situation: his feet were so ulcerated, that it was with difficulty that he had been able to reach St. Andrews; motion was torture to him, and he knew no place where he could expect secure refreshment and repose; for the country, like the other districts through which he had passed, was zealously calvinistical, and of course animated with inveterate hostility to the house of Stuart. At last he called to mind a servant of his mother's who had married a gardener of the name of Lillie, and lived at the distance of a few miles. Though her husband was a presbyterian, he did not on that account hesitate to confide in his fidelity.

"When I found myself within a step of Lillie's house, I eagerly seized the door with both my hands, to prevent my falling on the ground. My strength was totally exhausted, and I could not have proceeded one step farther, to escape even the scaffold; scarcely

could my legs support me when I leaned against the door. What an additional strength is given to us by necessity, and the desire to preserve our existence in such a case as mine, and what incredible efforts they enable us to make! Having knocked, Lillie opened the door, but did not recognize me in my disguise of a beggar. He said to me several times, with impatience and evident alarm, "Who are you?—What is your business?—Or whom do you want?" I made no reply, but advanced inside of the door, lest he should shut it in my face. This added to his alarm; and it is evident that he took me for some robber or housebreaker, for he trembled from head to foot. I asked him if there were any strangers in the house? His wife, who was sewing near the fire, knew my voice, and perceiving my dress, she called out immediately to her husband, "Good God, I know him; quick—shut the door." Lillie obeyed, without farther examining me, and following me to the light, also recognized me. I could scarce suppress a laugh, notwithstanding my pain, at the look of amazement of Lillie, when he recognized me under my disguise. Confounded, lost in astonishment, and petrified, he clasped his hands, and with uplifted eyes, exclaimed, "O, this does not surprise me! My wife and I were talking about you last night; and I said, that I would bet any thing in the world, that you were with that accursed race." I answered that he was in the right, to conclude I was, from the principles of attachment to the house of Stuart in which I had been educated. "But, at present, my good George," continued I, "you must aid me in escaping the gallows!"

"It was a severe and humiliating trial, for Lillie to be obliged, from gratitude, to give an asylum to a rebel, and to find himself under the necessity of succouring one of those very men whom he had so loudly condemned! No one in that neighbourhood had, on all public occasions, held forth with more zeal and eloquence, against the Pope and the Pretender, who were always coupled together. He was, however, an honest man, notwithstanding his fanatical principles. He assured me that he was deeply affected with my situation, and would do every thing in his power to save me, and to procure me a passage to the other side as soon as possible. Finding that I was utterly helpless, and incapable of stirring either leg or arm, Lillie and his wife took off my shoes and stockings; and as all the gardeners in Scotland have an empirical knowledge of medicine, Lillie having bathed my feet with whiskey, which made me suffer the most excruciating pain, afterwards applied a salve to them. They then drew on a pair of Lillie's stockings and slippers; after which, I found myself relieved, and quite a new person.

"I sent Lillie with my compliments to Mr. Beaton, his master, begging him not to take it amiss if his gardener should not be at his work at the usual hour, as I was concealed in his house, and had need of his services. Mr. Beaton sent back Lillie immediately to tell me, that he was exceedingly sorry that he could not wait upon me in person, as he had been unwell for some time past, and was just then going to bed; that it was also out of his power to offer me a bed in his house, where I would have been more conveniently lodged than at Lillie's;

but that he begged me most earnestly to send freely to him for whatever ^{he} might have occasion for. He wished that Lillie should take with him some wine, fowls, and other articles; but whatever desire Lillie might have that I should fare well in his house, he very prudently refused this offer, lest, as he told me, it should have excited a suspicion amongst the servants of Mr. Beaton, that he had some person concealed in his house. I praised Lillie very much for his prudence and discretion.

"Mrs. Lillie soon prepared a dish of steaks for my supper, which I devoured in haste, as I had more inclination to sleep than to eat, having been too days and nights on my legs, and without any sleep, except during the few hours I passed in the inclosure of Mr. Graham. Lillie having undressed me, carried me to bed in his arms, as it was utterly impossible for me to put a foot to the ground. I slept without waking from ten o'clock that evening, till half past nine on the following evening, as Mrs. Lillie took particular care not to make the least noise, nor would she even wake me, to receive the visit of Mr. Beaton, who had called on me." (P. 213—215.)

He was now close to the shores of the Frith of Forth. After some difficulties, in which he was forced to repose his confidence in presbyterian zealots, who were entire strangers to him, and yet were faithful to one whom they regarded as an offender against their God as well as against their king, he succeeded in reaching Leith, where he took refuge with a woman who had formerly been in the service of his mother. Thence he removed to the house of Lady Jane Douglas, where he remained in hiding a considerable time. The last of his adventures which we shall quote, is one of the methods of concealment which he was forced to adopt while in her house.

"After passing two months in the house of Lady Jane Douglas, in the most tranquil and philosophic manner, a servant maid, who returned from Edinburgh with provisions, told her companions in the kitchen, that whilst she was purchasing meat in the flesh-market, the lacquey of an English gentleman, a commissioner of the customs, whispered in her ear, "That they knew very well that I was concealed in the house of Lady Jane Douglas, her mistress: and that there was every reason for supposing that her house would be immediately searched." She added, that she had openly contradicted this calumny; and, in fact, she could so with a safe conscience, for no one in the house, except the gardener, knew any thing of the matter; and he went up stairs immediately to inform lady Jane, who came without delay into my room, accompanied by Mr. Stewart, to consult as to what was necessary to be done; fearing lest a detachment of soldiers should come, in the course of the day, to visit the house. It was then only nine o'clock in the morning.

"This intelligence filled me with the utmost grief and uneasiness. I trembled lest the extreme goodness of Lady Jane, in giving me an asylum in her house, should involve her in difficulties with the govern-

ment; and I was a thousand times more afraid of the disagreeable consequences which the being taken in her house would entail on her, than of the fate which awaited myself. When I feelingly expressed how much I regretted the dangers to which I exposed her, she replied, with her usual spirit and promptitude,—"If there were no risk, you would be under no obligation to me."—It was impossible to get out by the door into the court, on account of the servants, who, in that case, would see me from the kitchen; and there was no place in the house, which I examined all over, where I could remain concealed. But, as they were then making hay in an inclosure belonging to Lady Jane, Mr. Stewart proposed that I should conceal myself in a cock of hay. In order to succeed in this, it was necessary to let a footman into the secret, that he might watch the other servants, and seize a favourable opportunity for my leaving the house and entering the inclosure.

"I went out, in my waistcoat, with the footman and gardener, followed by Mr. Stewart. As it was necessary to observe a number of precautions, on account of some of the windows of the village which looked into the inclosure, we began to throw down all the cocks of hay, one after another; and the footman and gardener threw each other down on the hay, with which the one who happened to be undermost was covered by the other. This pretended amusement went on for some time, when they threw me in my turn, as a part of the same sport, and covered me with hay, till the cock in which I was concealed was raised as high as the rest, leaving me only a small aperture for breathing; and having given me a bottle of water and another of wine they withdrew.

"I do not think it possible to suffer more than I did the whole day: the weather was fine, but very warm; the excessive heat of my situation under the hay, which was like an oven, almost deprived me of respiration. Mr. Stewart came to see me from time to time, and exhorted me to be patient; and, indeed, I had need of patience, for my sufferings were occasionally so insupportable, that I was sometimes tempted to give the hay to the devil, and expose myself to whatever might happen, rather than to continue where I was. My regard for Lady Jane alone restrained me. After the most dreadful sufferings, from ten o'clock in the morning till nine at night, remaining always in the same attitude, without power to stir myself, and bathed in sweat, I was at length relieved. But when I came out of the hay my body was so bruised, and I was so weak, from my excessive transpiration, that it was with difficulty I could walk, leaning on the arm of Mr. Stewart, for my legs could scarcely support me. (P. 250—253.)

Shortly afterwards Johnstone proceeded to London, disguised as a pedlar, and, if his account be correct, rode the same horse the whole way, and yet was only seven days in getting to London. He remained there some time, detained by a very pretty love adventure, the account of which seems to be a trial of the author's genius for novel writing. At last his love tale was terminated by the necessity he was under of quitting England, which he con-

trived to accomplish by going as a servant in the suite of Lady Jane Douglas to Holland.

It is impossible to read Mr. Johnstone's memoirs without feeling our confidence in our fellow creatures confirmed and extended. Again and again was he obliged to put his life in the hands of men burning with political and religious zeal against the cause for which he fought, who regarded a partisan of the house of Stuart as a favourer of Antichrist and a son of perdition, and who had every worldly temptation to deliver him into the hands of the civil or military authorities. Of their sentiments towards him and his party we may judge from his feelings towards them. "St. Andrews," says he, "was full of the accursed race of Calvinists, hypocrites who cover over their crimes with the veil of religion: fraudulent and dishonest in their dealings; who carry their holy dissimulation so far as to take off their bonnets to say grace when they take even a pinch of snuff; who have the name of God constantly in their mouths and hell in their hearts. No town ever so much deserved the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah." Yet amid all this fury of religious and political party feeling, the strongest motives to treachery, and the danger of serving a person denounced a traitor by the laws, Johnstone experienced in every instance the fullest truth and often the most zealous service. There must have been some noble stamina of moral feeling among a people, who could adhere thus firmly to the dictates of uncorrupted integrity, in spite of all the seductions of passion, prejudice, interest, and fear.

ART. V.—THE UNITARIAN CONTROVERSY.

1. *Discourses on the Principal Points of the Socinian Controversy.* By Ralph Wardlaw, DD. Glasgow. Third Edition. Longman and Co. London, 1819.

2. *A Vindication of Unitarianism, in Reply to Mr. Wardlaw's Discourses on the Socinian Controversy.* By James Yates, MA. Glasgow. Second Edition. Eaton. London, 1818.

3. *Unitarianism Incapable of Vindication: a Reply to the Rev. James Yates's Vindication of Unitarianism.* By Ralph Wardlaw. Longman and Co. London, 1816.

4. *The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity briefly Stated and Defended: and the Church of England Vindicated from the Charge of Uncharitableness in retaining the Athanasian Creed.* By Thomas Hartwell Horne, MA. Cadell. London, 1820.

It may appear strange to our readers that we should so often revert to the Unitarian controversy, on which we have more

than once touched in recent Numbers. But Unitarianism is to this day professed and defended. There are Unitarian congregations in many parts of the country. We still, therefore, feel it our duty occasionally to "contend for the faith" as it was once delivered to the saints."

In entering on this subject, we must begin by expressing our sentiments upon one preliminary point of great importance. We think it ought to be clearly understood that the differences between the general Church and the Unitarians are by no means slight or unimportant. And we are the more particular in noticing this point, because attempts have sometimes been made to produce an opposite impression ;—to represent the matters in dispute as of secondary importance ;—to smooth off all the projecting points of the controversy. And although those who are acquainted with the subject can never be deceived by such representations, yet the indifferent and the ignorant, who together constitute a large portion of the community, may be misled by them. Therefore we think it necessary to set out with expressing a conviction, that our respective views are nothing less than totally opposite.

It is usual with Christians of different sects to say, we are going to heaven by different ways, and shall all meet there at the last. We hail the sentiment. When the roads by which the different parties are travelling run nearly parallel, or only diverge a little, we think nothing more possible. They may all lead to the same place. But suppose we are going one way along a road, and meet a person going the other. And suppose this person informs us that he is bound for the place which we are bound for. Here the case is totally altered. If such a person tells us boldly that he is going right, and that we are going wrong, we think it strange, but yet it may be so. We listen to what he has to say, and, possibly, turn about and go with him. But suppose he pursues a different plan. Suppose he says, "You are going to such a place. I am going there, too. You are going in that direction. I am going in this. You say your way is right. I say mine is. Farewell. We shall meet there at last."—This would be evidently absurd. We could not be going in opposite directions, yet both be going to the same place.—Yet so stands the case between the general Church and the Unitarians. We are not merely going different, we are going opposite ways. One therefore *must* be going wrong :—not merely going a little out of the way, but going totally wrong. Let us therefore understand one another. Whichever is right, the other is in a total error. The religion either of the member of the general Church, or of the Unitarian, must be a violation of the first commandment. We do not worship

the same God. It is not one of those cases which afford room for concession. To whichever party we belong, every admission that the other party is, or may be, in any degree, in the right, contains an admission that our own is, or may be, in the same degree, totally in the wrong. If they are right, the general Church is idolatrous. If we are right,—then, they deny the divinity of the Supreme Being. This is a subject which Unitarians have sometimes treated lightly. Not so Dr. Wardlaw.

“It is very obvious, that two systems, on which the sentiments, on subjects such as these, are in direct opposition, cannot, with any propriety, be confounded together under one common name. That both should be Christianity, is impossible; else Christianity is a term which distinguishes nothing. Viewing the matter abstractly, and without affirming, for the present, what is truth and what is error, this, I think, I may with confidence affirm, that to call schemes so opposite in all their great leading articles by a common appellation, is more absurd, than it would be to confound together those two irreconcilable theories in astronomy, of which the one places the earth, and the other the sun, in the centre of the planetary system. They are, in truth, *essentially different religions*. For if opposite views as to the *object of worship*, the *ground of hope for eternity*, the *rule of faith and duty*, and the *principles and motives of true obedience*;—if these do not constitute different religions, we may, without much difficulty, discover some principle of union and identity, amongst all religions whatever; we may realize the doctrine of Pope’s Universal Prayer; and extend the right hand of fellowship to the worshippers at the Mosque, and to the votaries of Brama.” (Discourses, p. 33.)

To speak the truth, if Unitarians are in earnest, they must, though they may not choose to say so, they *must* consider the general Church as heretical. That is, they must believe, in their own minds, that upon certain points of vital importance, we are totally in the wrong. They will say, “No. We differ from you, indeed. But whatever may be your way of worshipping, we are not so uncharitable as to call it heresy.” But we answer, it must be so. The difference is by no means upon trifling points. It is upon the very principles, and upon the peculiar, the distinguishing features of the Christian religion. We are not merely going different ways. We repeat it—we are going opposite ways:—so that if they are going right, we must of necessity be going wrong. Do they really believe that they are in the way of salvation? Then they must of necessity believe that we are in a total error. Will they again say, “No?” What then are we to conclude? What can we conclude but this? That, after all, they are not sincere:—that, after all, they do not with their whole heart believe their own to be the right way. In fact, they cannot. If they were seriously convinced of this, they must

be seriously convinced that we are totally in the wrong. They may not call our faith heresy. But if they are hearty in their own, they must consider it heresy. We cannot both be Christians.

“ The attempt to reduce the magnitude, or to lighten the weight, of the differences between us, is as vain a one as could well be made. They respect all that is essential and fundamental in Christianity. With as much wisdom might you try to unite the poles, or to bring east and west together. It is not at all a case, in which, by mutually explaining and softening down, the sentiments of the contending parties may be made to meet, or even to approximate. It is mere childish affectation of liberality, to talk as if they could. The two systems, which of them soever be the right or the wrong, stand as antipodes to each other, with the whole world between them. If it be Christianity, that the Son and the Holy Spirit are God, equal with the Father, and entitled to supreme adoration and homage :—that man is a fallen, guilty, and depraved creature, and, as such, utterly incapable of obtaining acceptance with God, on the ground of his own obedience or righteousness ;—that the great design of Christ’s coming into the world was, to atone for human guilt by the sacrifice of himself ; and that his sufferings and death were thus vicarious and expiatory, and his resurrection from the dead the evidence of their efficacy, as well as the pledge of life to all who trust in his finished work ;—that the influence of the Divine Spirit is necessary for the illumination of the understanding in the things of God, and for the renovation and progressive sanctification of the soul ;—that the present life is the only period during which sinners of the human race can be brought to ‘ repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ,’ and to consequent salvation ;—that the good works of believers form no part of the ground of their justification before God, and their enjoyment of eternal life, but, they themselves being previously ‘ accepted in the Beloved,’ their works also, springing from a heart renewed by grace, are accepted and approved, as fruits and evidences of that ‘ faith which worketh by love :’—if these, and other kindred doctrines, be Christianity, how, in the name of common sense, is it possible, that their opposites should be Christianity too? Is it not infantile weakness, for the abettors of either of these opposite systems to be angry with the supporters of the other, because they decline giving them the appellation of *Christians*? Why are we to convert this sacred name into a mere epithet of unmeaning compliment? The inconsistency is equal on both sides. It is just as absurd for Mr. Yates to bestow it on me, as it would be for me to bestow it on him. If my opponent be a Christian, I am a deluded idolater, miserably deceived in the object of my worship, and the foundation of my hope! Why should we disguise the matter, and delude ourselves and one another, by taking a name in common, when we have hardly a principle in common? I am quite prepared for the ordinary charge of illiberality and narrow-mindedness. But the charge, in such a case, has no foundation in Scripture, or in common sense; and I therefore

disregard it, and cheerfully yield the world's plaudits to those who, so unphilosophically, as well as so unscripturally, confound, under one common term, things so essentially different." (Reply, p. 379, &c.)

We find Mr. Yates, again, paying high compliments to Mr. Wardlaw, and speaking of his "very excellent observations," (Vindication of Unitarianism, 2d edit. p. 14,) whereas he must know very well that he and his antagonist are of different religions.

We cannot enter more particularly on the present subject, without pausing to observe, that much evil appears to us to originate from that species of liberality of which Unitarians are the advocates. It is, we apprehend, the liberality of indifference. "I am not so much attached to my way of thinking, but that you are very welcome to keep yours." Now we see not where is the charity of such a style of sentiment. Charity may wish well to one of a different opinion. But charity cannot alter the nature of things. Charity cannot reconcile opposite sentiments, so as to make two hostile systems equally credible. The cause of this kind of liberality we suspect to be, that Unitarians, in fact, have no fixed views, have no determinate set of opinions. Thus they will sometimes argue about passages of Scripture with much apparent earnestness; as if, provided the meaning of the passage were once determined, they would readily defer to its authority. But bring them a passage where the meaning is determined, and they decline to defer to it. Now, if they think that a passage of Scripture whose meaning is clear, is not always to be deferred to as decisive, they might say so. But then, we ask, why do they ever argue a passage at all? Why do they contest its meaning? Why do they not say at once, "If it do mean so, if it be proved to mean so, even then we will not take it, after all. We have a thousand loopholes to creep out by?" The opposite course of conduct affords occasion to suspect a species of mental reservation: to suspect, that with all this earnest arguing there is no real earnestness. The whole contest is reduced to a mere *συναμαχία*. No matter if the passage be not as we argue. We still can deny its authority.

As to Mr. Yates, it is utterly impossible to find out what are his real sentiments upon some of the leading points in the Socinian controversy: and therefore we think it is but natural to ask if he has any. At page 15 he says, "Whether the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures be a doctrine of the Christian religion, is one of those questions upon which Unitarians are divided in opinion." The subject is one, by the bye, on which there is very little of practical division among them. At another place, he gives us a little light into his sentiments,

"If it be asked, what kind and degree of evidence would be sufficient to establish the doctrine of the Trinity, thus understood, I reply, No evidence whatsoever;" (P. 63) "not even the clearest declarations of the Scriptures themselves. For its own intrinsic absurdity is more decisive *against* it, than any contrary evidence could be *for* it. To use the words of Priestley, it is a doctrine 'which councils and parliaments may decree, but which miracles cannot prove.' " ... "Agreeably, therefore, to the axioms laid down in the Chapter upon Mysteries, (p. 1. c. 4.) we ought to reject this doctrine, even though it were plainly stated in the Scriptures; because it is in itself impossible, and because it contradicts one of the fundamental articles of both natural and revealed religion, the Unity of God." (Vindication, p. 126.)

Which comes to this.—Bring me something that my reason approves of, and I will believe it upon the authority of the Bible. But bring me something that offends my reason, and I will do no such thing. Ergo, the Bible is of no authority with me, except where no authority is wanted.—It may appear to some a pleasing token of liberality when Mr. Yates speaks of the points of contention among ecclesiastics, as "unmeaning sounds and frivolous disputes." (P. 253.) But we see to what this liberality tends, when shortly after (p. 259.) our author speaks with great tenderness of "the extensive schism of the Mohammedans ... from among those who believed in the Divine authority of Jesus." The extensive schism of the Mohammedans!!!

But the fact is, that from what is written by one Unitarian, we never can divine what are the sentiments of the rest. Sometimes we find their authors taking up quite an unexpected ground. Mr. Hutton, of Leeds, assures us in his "sermon," respecting a leading doctrine of Christianity, that if it "were indisputably the doctrine of the gospel," he "should not think himself warranted to reject *the fact*, merely because he could not comprehend the *mode* of it." (P. 74.) This is absolutely abandoning the ground which Unitarians generally occupy. So also Mr. Joseph Hunter, in his sermon preached at Bath, says that whatever the Christian Scriptures contain, the Unitarian "holds himself bound to receive. In his view of the subject, their decision on every question is to be final. There are to be no further arguments. What is there revealed, whatever it may be, that he feels himself bound to receive." (P. 27.) This is totally at variance with Mr. Yates. According to him there are doctrines, which "not even the clearest declarations of the Scriptures themselves" would establish. Mr. George Harris, on the contrary, forgets himself, and speaks his mind freely. We find him talking, in the preface to a second edition of his sermon preached at Liverpool, April 19, 1818, of carrying "the pure light of the gospel into those countries which are yet enveloped

in the darkness, the gross darkness of reputed orthodoxy." Here he speaks like a man. So he does when he speaks of our system being soon consigned to that oblivion—"from which, I trust," he adds, "it will never more emerge, to blast and blight all the kind and holy feelings of humanity." Here we see the Unitarian. So also, when referring to late events at Geneva, he says, "It would however not be the less consistent, if those who now so loudly declaim against the intolerance of the pastors of Geneva, and who are pouring forth their lamentations over the apostate church, in bitterness of spirit, would cease to designate themselves by the name of the murderer of Servetus!" (P. 72.) If Unitarians would always speak in this manner, we should know with whom we had to deal.

But as there is nothing like consistency of opinion to be found among them, we can but conclude that they have not yet made up their minds as to what are the real opinions of their body. We may also conclude, from the tone of spurious liberality which they maintain, that when in particular cases their views are more decided, even there they have by no means just notions of their true degree of importance. To us they appear like men stumbling and floating about upon broken pieces of ice; steady now and then for a time, but borne hither and thither by the wind and currents, and never for one moment upon a secure resting-place.

Their main object, indeed, seems to be, to make out a case, and to maintain a good appearance in print. And if Mr. Yates's book was written to answer the purpose of a Unitarian stock-book, a something to put into people's hands, we do not hesitate to say that we think he has succeeded. All is cautious, plausible, and smooth. Yet the design is apparent enough. A case is to be made out. Hence attempts are sometimes made to prove a point, and forgotten as soon as made. Therefore the argument can only have been framed for the occasion. And thus the Unitarian goes on, taking up one position after another, assuming various attitudes of defence or of aggression for a time, and then abandoning them for new ones. It is evident that a system thus supported can have no better foundation than a house built upon the sand. The remark will apply to various Unitarian works which we have lately examined; and in which we have met with so many assertions which can only have been made on the supposition, that the reader would have no opportunity to ascertain the truth; so many representations of the views and meanings of authors, which could only be offered on the supposition that the reader would not have the authors to refer to; so many artful, so many daring perversions of the truth, that we can only imagine one object to have been had in view, that

of making up a case at any rate, of getting up something that might serve to be handed to the ignorant and credulous, and convince them at once that Unitarians alone hold the true faith, and that all who oppose them are ignorant, bigoted, and unjust.

It must form part of such a design, too, to get over difficulties. All must be made smooth. The way must be cleared before the learner. And when there is any difficulty in the path, the Unitarians are admirable hands at getting over it. This appears, especially, in their way of disposing of inconvenient passages of Scripture. It is astonishing how clean are the wounds which they thus make in the vitals of Christianity. Mr. Marshall, for instance, in a letter to the Rev. T. White, in consequence of his "address to the inhabitants of St. Alban's," makes a singular alteration in 2 Cor. v. 19. For "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself," (*Θεὸς ὃν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλάσσων ἑαυτῷ*), he gives us—"God in (that is *by* or *through*) Christ reconciled the world to himself." (P. 16.)—Dr. Priestley pursues much the same plan with regard to the epistle attributed to Barnabas. The passage which chiefly troubles him he avers to be an interpolation: and says, with respect to the rest, that "an Unitarian will find no difficulty in accommodating them to his principles."* It is clear, then, that when Scripture stands in the way of the Unitarians, they are determined to get the better of it at any rate. The following are the words of Dr. Priestley, quoted both by Dr. Wardlaw and Dr. Magee.

"Though not satisfied with any interpretation that has been given of this extraordinary passage," (John vi. 62,) "yet, rather than believe our Saviour to have existed in any other state before the creation of the world, or to have left some state of great dignity and happiness when he came hither, I would have recourse to the old and exploded Socinian idea of Christ's actual ascent into heaven, or of his imagining that he had been carried up thither in a vision, which, like that of St. Paul, he had not been able to distinguish from a reality:—nay, I would not build an article of faith of such magnitude on the correctness of John's recollection and representation of our Lord's language:—and so strange and incredible does the hypothesis of a pre-existent state appear, that, sooner than admit it, I would suppose the whole verse to be an interpolation; or that the old apostle dictated one thing, and his amanuensis wrote another."

Thus it appears how the Unitarians treat the Bible. Their views are evidently independent of that book. They have views not taken from the Scriptures. Then they come to the Scriptures, and regulate their views of their contents by the views

* See British Review, No. XIII. Art. X. p. 236.

which they had before. This principle of judgment is clearly betrayed by Mr. Yates, in a passage noticed by Dr. Wardlaw. The latter gentleman having remarked concerning John viii. 58, that "our Lord expressly affirms that he existed before Abraham," Mr. Yates observes, "The truth of his observation will be admitted probably by all Unitarians, who believe in the *pre-existence* of Christ:" (Vindication, p. 199 :) which is as much as to say, that Unitarians will believe the Bible, if it agrees with their own previous belief, but not otherwise.

It is impossible not to notice the mode of speaking adopted by the Unitarians, concerning the sacred volume: the sense of the whole body is but too well expressed in those words of Dr. Priestley:—"Sooner than admit it, I would suppose the whole verse to be an interpolation; or that the old apostle dictated one thing, and his amanuensis wrote another." Thus too, Mr. Marshall, in his letter, speaks of the assertion of our Lord's Divinity, as giving "that character of paradox and absurdity to the Scriptures, which makes it the duty of every honest and sane mind to reject them with scorn." (P. 33.) So also Mr. Yates, speaking of a kindred doctrine, says, "the testimony of the Scriptures would not prove it to be true; on the contrary, its occurrence in the Scriptures would prove them to be false." (P. 158.) But Mr. Worsley, author of "An Inquiry into the Origin of Christmas-day," goes further still.

"Mankind have resembled each other on every spot, whether savage or civilized, wherever a society of them has been formed. They have soon departed from the beautiful simplicity of natural religion, and have imagined some of themselves inspired to introduce new ideas into the worship of the Divinity, and new characteristics into his disposition, and also into his nature. With the Hebrews and the northern nations he has assumed a similar character; the Lord of Hosts, the God of War: nor was the Jupiter of Rome less famed for his warlike achievements." (P. 47.)

The title, then, of Lord of Hosts, was a "new idea introduced into the worship of the Divinity," by some person who "imagined himself inspired." We took this for Deism. But the author describes himself as "a Minister to a Dissenting Congregation," and dedicates his work "to the members of the Unitarian fund." The same gentleman speaks of the appearance of the angel to the shepherds, and of another event which attended our Lord's birth, in the following terms.

"There is no small confusion in the present manner of speaking of these people—our New Testament calls them shepherds, by some they are described as magi, or wise men, and the French almanack knows them by the terms, *les trois rois*, the three kings. The tale of the star too is a strange tale, and not borne out or explained by any thing

whatever that is found in either sacred or profane history; in short, as it is an affair that is in no sort tangible, we are obliged to leave it where we find it; though we fain would know what it means." (P. 5, note.)

One part of the Unitarian system is, not to take the whole sense of Scripture as it stands, and to believe it reconcilable with itself in every part, but to take only a portion, and make the rest give way to it. In this manner sacred writ is set up in opposition to itself. This is particularly the case with respect to that important subject, the nature of our Saviour. Here they take what relates to his humanity, and set it up against what relates to his Divinity. Dr. Wardlaw has an excellent canon upon this subject:—"that of two contending systems, that one ought to be preferred, which not only affords a natural explanation of those texts by which it seems to be itself supported; but, at the same time, furnishes a satisfactory principle of harmony, between these, and those other passages, which have the appearance of countenancing its opposite." (*Discourses*, p. 43.) This canon of interpretation is afterwards instructively applied to the doctrine of the twofold nature of the Saviour.

"Here are two classes of passages, both contained in the same book,—both claiming to have their testimony received, as of the same authority.—Here are two bands of witnesses. They all seem to speak in language plain and distinctly intelligible; but they appear to contradict one another.—What, then, shall we make of them?—Whether are we to receive the testimony of the one, or that of the other?—Or must we reject that of both?—Or shall we apply scourges, and racks, and screws, and all the instruments of torture, to force from the one, or from the other, a declaration, that they did not at all intend to express what their language seems, beyond all doubt, to convey?—Or, lastly, is there no principle of reconciliation and harmony between their apparently discordant testimonies? Is there no ground on which both may consistently be believed; since both appear to be supported by the very same measure of credible evidence?—Here is the question;—here, I apprehend, the one great point on which the whole controversy turns. And in answer to the question, I still affirm, as before, There *is* such a principle—there *is* such a ground—and besides it there is *no other*. It is to be found, as formerly stated, in the double view which is given by the apostle Paul, of the person and official character of Jesus, when he says respecting him, that 'being in the form of God, he thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon himself the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of man; and being found in fashion as a man, humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.' Admit the double view of the person of Christ, which is here stated, and the difficulty vanishes.

The testimony of the different witnesses, elicited without torture, and interpreted without perversion, becomes *one testimony*." (Discourses, p. 184, &c.)

Whatever be the doctrine of any part of the Scriptures, that, we apprehend, is a doctrine of the Bible. We mean, it is a fixed, incontrovertible point, and must be included in our faith, and taken in as a portion of the system to be believed, whatever else we find in other parts of the book. Dr. Wardlaw, indeed, has given us a very just view of the state of the argument between the Unitarians and ourselves. Both parties quote Scripture in support of their opinions. But there is this difference. Their quotations may stand good, and unsettle no part of our opinions. But, on the contrary, if our quotations stand good, their system must come to the ground.

But, according to the Unitarian views, proofs are no proofs. That is, evidence may be set aside by argument. The Word of God, even when allowed to possess a certain degree of ill-defined authority, may be reasoned out of its plain meaning. When they have taken the book, or any part of it, to be authentic, their system leaves them at liberty, if they afterwards do not like it, to regard it as authentic no longer. The truth of every statement is to be decided, not by the evidence in favour of the authenticity of that statement, or against it, but by opinions formed upon the subject before the statement comes to them. Take, for instance, the case of the disputed text of the three witnesses. They regard it as false, and accordingly are apt to speak of it as asserting the doctrine of the Trinity, which indeed, whether false or true, it does in very plain terms. But suppose, by some unforeseen means, we were enabled to prove that the text was unquestionably authentic; we doubt not they would then begin to reason upon it, and not rest till they had made out a proof of its not containing the doctrine, or a shadow of the doctrine, of the Trinity.

Now it is clear that if such principles of reasoning were generally adopted, no knowledge of any thing at all strange or unaccountable could in any way be communicated to the human mind. For, then, it would receive indeed what was plain and intelligible, but that alone. And from the adoption of precisely such principles it is, that ignorant persons, who have seen but little of the world, continue in wilful ignorance all their lives. Tell such persons that there are parts of the world where the shadows point to the south at noon; or others, where the sun, at particular seasons, is never below the horizon during the twenty-four hours; or others, where there are black swans, and plants which blossom from the old wood of former years; and they will say it is impossible, because they know of nothing

of the kind. Anegro, on the same principle, who had never travelled from between the tropics, if told that there are countries where water at times is hardened through the cold, would refuse his credence for similar reasons. Thus, wherever there is a spirit of ill-regulated incredulity, and an ignorant impatience of instruction, much knowledge is quite shut out. And fatal indeed is the case, where the knowledge thus excluded is the knowledge of the true God and our only Saviour, Jesus Christ.

Thus there will always be a difficulty in coping with Unitarians; not only because of their readiness to explain away the meaning of Scripture, but also because of their disbelief of it where there is no question about the meaning at all. No wonder, then, that their views of Christianity are so imperfect. "According to them," says Dr Wardlaw, "the grand distinction of the gospel is, its ascertaining the certainty of a resurrection from the dead, a judgment to come, and a future state of rewards and punishments." And it is singularly observable that there is not one of these three important doctrines, which constitute the sum and substance of the Unitarian gospel, that Unitarians have not perverted. With regard to the resurrection from the dead, we shall have to observe, before we have done, a singular misrepresentation. With regard to the judgment to come, they infinitely mitigate its awfulness, by detracting from the dignity of the Judge. And with regard to the doctrine of a future state, they mask its aspect of terror towards the wicked, by the universalism which pervades their volumes.

At the same time, since they have not what is really peculiar to the gospel, we are not to wonder if we sometimes find them insisting much on what is not so. Mr. Yates has published a sermon, which he calls "The peculiar Doctrines of the Gospel." The first half of this discourse is occupied in an attempt to show what are *not* the peculiar doctrines of the gospel. Then we come to what *are* so: and the three following are given;—the resurrection of the dead—that the love of God is the first and greatest commandment—and universal philanthropy. We hardly think, however, that either of these doctrines can be called peculiar to the gospel. The Pharisees held the resurrection of the dead in common with St. Paul: "I have hope toward God," said he, "which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." (Acts xxiv. 15.) Nay, a little while before he had only occasion to say that he maintained the doctrine, to make a party in his favour. (See Acts xxiii. 6—9.) As to the doctrine that the love of God is the first and greatest commandment, the scribes, (Mark xii 32, 33,) and the lawyers, (Luke x.

26, 27,) seem to have had some idea of it. And, with regard to the doctrine of universal philanthropy, Christians have had it in common with Franklin, with the French theophilanthropists, and with Terence. It is singular that, on the subject of "the first and greatest commandment," Mr. Yates gives a reference to the very passage cited by us from St. Mark. St. Luke is decidedly against him; and we find no reference to this apostle. —The true distinction of Christians is the *practice* of these duties. Happy would it be, were the distinction more strongly marked!

All this confusion, we apprehend, comes from not knowing what is peculiar to the gospel. From the same cause, too, many of the most celebrated defenders of the external evidences of Christianity have been persons unsound in their views on internal and essential points. They stand up for externals, because to them the externals are all. In fighting for them, they are fighting for life. Wanting the internal evidence in their hearts, the external evidence to them is every thing. They have indeed a conviction that the Christian religion is true. And so had the people who believed in the name of Jesus, "because they saw the miracles that he did."—"But Jesus," we are told, "did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man, for he knew what was in man."

Then, too, in contending with Unitarians, one is often disconcerted by finding them still persevering to urge the often exploded doctrine, that what is mysterious is not the object of faith. This self-contradictory notion is indeed rejected by one of their writers, as we have seen, where he assures us that he would not reject a fact, merely because he could not understand the mode of it. Yet, beyond a question, without it, Unitarianism comes to the ground. Therefore Unitarian authors, in some shape or other, are generally very zealous in defending it. "I believe," says Mr. Marshall, "in the existence of a blade of grass, because I see it; but I believe nothing about its formation and growth, because I know nothing about it." (p. 8.) Now such a doctrine comes to this:—that many things are both credible and incredible; both true and false. For instance. Two persons see the same phenomenon take place. One is learned, and can account for it. Therefore, he is to believe it. The other is ignorant, and cannot account for it. Therefore, he is not to believe it. This is like the doctrine which was started some time ago in Ireland: a doctrine, if we recollect right, to this effect; that a man who can raise three shillings and sixpence ought to have a Bible; but a man who cannot, ought to go without one. We smiled when we heard Dr.

Thorpé, at a public meeting, with true Hibernian humour and felicity, expatiating upon this doctrine; but we little thought that another, so nearly resembling it, would be found deducible from the principles of any class of our own countrymen. If we pursue their principles, it follows, that we are not to believe many facts which occur under our observation. If we are not to believe the doctrine of the Trinity because we do not understand the mode of its subsistence, then we are not to believe the fact of the blade's growing, because we cannot tell how it grows. Suppose, for instance, a Unitarian going from Dover to France. The wind is foul. However, they beat to windward, and, somehow or other, contrive to get in. But how is this? Make way against the wind, and that by the aid of the wind? Reason forbids him to believe it. Behold him, however, at length safely landed in Calais's harbour. According to his own system, it is imperative on him to deny the fact. He is bound to maintain that he is not at Calais, that he is still at Dover. Or take another instance. Put our Unitarian tourist on board a steam-packet at Billingsgate. The tide is running up. How then is the vessel to get down? How is she to make her way against the course of the water by a power acting upon the water? The thing is contrary to reason. At length, however, it is announced that they have reached Margate. He goes upon deck, and an incredible phenomenon presents itself. He is within the pier. But shall he then believe his eyes? No. He will act a more rational part. He will believe his reason. "The steward may say we are there, but I say it is impossible. This is not Margate pier, but the Custom House stairs. These are hoys about to sail from London to Margate, not hoys about to sail from Margate to London. These are the cockneys of London come down to stare at us, not the cockneys of Margate. You, Mr. Steward, are at Margate. That I allow. For you can understand the principle of the steam-vessel. But to me it is perfectly incomprehensible. I, therefore, am still off the Tower. Unless, indeed, the tide has carried us up to Battersea, which, by all the laws of motion, it ought to have done."—Thus, some years ago, when a racehorse was expected at Paris from London, the French mathematicians set to work, and proved by algebra that it was physically impossible for the animal to go the distance for which he was backed, within the given time. Shortly after he arrived, and performed the match. So much at present for the ingenious Mr. Marshall of St. Alban's.

Mr. Wardlaw's observation upon doctrines above reason, affords a good addition to a well-known idea of Locke's.

"The doctrine of which I now speak, is freely admitted to be *above*

reason. But it is of consequence to observe, that, on this very account, it seems impossible to prove it *contrary to reason*. It is a common and just remark, that there is an essential difference between any thing being *above reason*, and being *contrary to it*; and that it may be the former without being the latter. I think, we may go a step farther; and affirm, as I have just hinted, that the very circumstance of its being the former, precludes the possibility of proving it to be the latter. I question whether any thing that is above reason, can ever be shown to be contrary to it." (Discourses, p. 22.)

We are inclined to go a step further still: and to suggest, that nothing which is above reason admits of being proved, by internal evidence, to be *according to reason*. It may admit of being proved, by internal evidence, to be good, to be salutary, to be true. But, being above reason, it cannot be proved by internal evidence to be according to reason. The proof must be external. This is the only kind of proof which the case admits of.—And this proof Unitarians reject. People must be indeed far from truth, when they reject the only possible medium by which the knowledge of spiritual things can be conveyed to them. "For my own part," says Dr. Wardlaw, "so far from being staggered by finding mysteries in revelation, I am satisfied that the entire absence of them would have formed a much stronger ground for suspicion." (P. 25.)

We have another cause of complaint against the Unitarians, (which we shall now, however, only briefly note,) in their manner of viewing spiritual and invisible, in comparison with material and visible things. Their idea seems to be, that the former are regulated by the laws of the latter: that wherever a law is found to prevail with regard to the natural creation, that same law, *à majori*, must govern the supernatural creation, nay, must govern the actions of the Creator of all things. Views of this kind they betray, in their mode of getting over the argument for the doctrine of the Trinity drawn from the plurality of the Hebrew word אלהים: arguing that because kings speak of themselves in the plural number, *therefore*, by analogy, the Almighty does so:—as if the Creator's mode of speaking of himself could be regulated by his creatures. If they answer that the Almighty never, actually, *did* employ the plural mode of expression in speaking of himself, but, is only represented to have done so by the sacred writers, we reply that this answer of theirs only tends to confirm our opinion, already expressed, that they do not believe their Bible. 'It is in much the same spirit that Captain J. Gifford, RN, author of "the Unitarian's Defence," speaking of two things, both of which he supposes to be predicated of the Deity, as "distinct of themselves," (meaning thereby, if we understand him, *irreconcilable*,) adds "nor can

one be interchanged for the other without a subversion of the established order of nature." (P. 25.) As if, supposing it pleased the Almighty to interchange one thing for another, the subversion of the established order of nature could stop him for one moment.—Thus does this author regulate the Creator by the thing created.—But this topic of discussion would lead us into a very extensive field, and we leave it to proceed to plainer matters.

We have to mention, then, that the unbelief of the Unitarian to us appears to be connected, as unbelief generally is, with extreme credulity. When there are stronger reasons for believing a thing than for disbelieving it, the unbeliever is more credulous than the believer: because, though he will not believe the particular fact which is offered for his acceptance, he will believe that which is more difficult of credence: namely, he will believe that stronger evidence is inferior to weaker—that the more powerful testimony is to be rejected, and the feebler to be received. To us it appears that the Unitarians, in rejecting what they call difficult of credence, are often compelled, as their only alternative, to accept something that is more difficult. Some of their writers, for instance, while they deny the actual omnipresence of Christ, seem willing to admit, as the only way of at all satisfying various passages of Scripture, his virtual omnipresence. Now to believe in the virtual presence of any being, rather than in his actual presence, to us appears a credulous preference of the more difficult alternative. We shall not imitate the plan of our opponents, and, because we cannot understand how there can be such a thing as virtual presence, where there is not real presence, say it is impossible:—because, with God, nothing is impossible:—and therefore it always gives us an unpleasant feeling, when dogmatical persons pronounce any thing to be impossible, even though it appear to contradict our conceptions of the Divine attributes. But, we ask, what can be more *unlikely*, than that any being should be in operation, where he is not,—should be acting, where he is not,—should be putting forth his power, where he is not? What is the power of God? Is it an agency? an influence? a vapour? a subtle and ethereal substance? No. It is none of these. It is God. Wherever God is acting, there he is. Mr. Horne boldly, but, we think, justly, affirms of our Saviour, that "his acting in all places, in the preservation of all things which exist, necessarily infers his being present in all those places, in all points of duration, and in every part of space where he exerts his preserving and upholding power." (P. 31.) Now we object to the word "necessarily" in one sense in which it may be taken, because we know of no necessity but the will of God.

But, with this merely verbal exception, we entirely agree with Mr. Horne. And we think that the doctrine of a virtual presence where there is not a real presence is not only a proof of extreme credulity in those who hold it, but may fairly be reckoned, (like the idea of a man's becoming divine in knowledge and in power, but not in extension, spoken of by Dr. Wardlaw in his "Reply," p. 210,) as one of the "*mysteries of Unitarianism*." Thus then stands the case. The unbelievers are credulous.—The foes of every thing mysterious have their mysteries. Such are the contradictions of the

"Conjurati cœlum rescindere fratres!"

Still, however, unbelief is the grand characteristic of the Unitarian system. And a token of it we find, in their virtually rejecting truths which are very commonly considered to belong to what is called natural religion. We particularly allude to those, to which we have just been referring; the omnipresence and universal agency of God; (which indeed if any of us believed as we ought, we should be very different from what we are). It is to a strong but latent repugnance to these doctrines that we trace much of the Unitarian error. Hence, we imagine, arises their hostility to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. This doctrine cannot be received as it is presented for our acceptance in the New Testament, unless we will believe that God is every where present and acting. If we come to consider, we shall find that this is the cause of the resistance which our hearts make to the doctrine. It seems to us, that Unitarians deny that the Holy Spirit is God, because they believe that there may be a manifestation of the Divine power, an influence, an operation, and yet God himself not be present. The same remark applies to the doctrine of Christ. We apprehend, that if it had merely been taught in the Bible that there exist in heaven three divine Persons in the Unity of the Godhead, few who believe in the external evidences of Christianity would have been solicitous to deny the doctrine. If this were all, there would never have been persons calling themselves Unitarians. But tell them that one of these divine Persons was Jesus Christ of Nazareth, that this Jesus Christ was born in such a country in such a year, that in his person God held converse with men, and the human nature was taken into the divine,—nay, tell them, especially, that the connexion thus formed, still exists and is maintained; that the whole was and is a real transaction and a real fact;—this, we apprehend, is what startles and offends them. And lamentable must be the state of a man while he partakes of all the infirmities and all the guilt of human nature unrenewed, and yet God cannot come

down from heaven to deliver him from this sad and dangerous condition, but the very idea is revolting to his mind. In that man's heart there must be an obstacle that blocks out all religious influence,—a barrier to the entrance of saving truth, which nothing but Omnipotence can subdue. It is hard to form a conception of any man more completely cut off from God.

We must observe also, on the debilitating tendency of the Unitarian scheme; of which many examples might be given; but the only token which we shall now mention, is in the scantiness of Unitarian exertion to propagate the knowledge of even what Unitarians call Christianity. They have, it seems, actually got what may be called a little mission-station at Madras, of which Mr. Harris, in his book already mentioned, gives us some particulars. It is striking to observe how Unitarianism limps and droops, when it comes to the test of actual exertion. Here we have a variety of particulars laid before us, to Unitarians, no doubt, extremely interesting. But in what does it all end? A missionary and some books are wanted.—And mark, gentle reader, the elegiac strains of Mr. Harris.

“Surely the time cannot be distant when some well qualified and benevolent individual, will be induced to go from this country, and submit to the difficulties and perils of a Missionary life, in order to propagate pure and uncorrupt Christianity among the poor Indians on the Malabar coast. Surely such an individual could even now be found, if the Unitarian body could but be roused from its apathy. But it is indeed strange, ‘tis passing strange,’ tis pitiful, that nothing should yet have been done even towards raising the small sum of 500*l*. (which would be the probable cost of the undertaking,) for the purpose of defraying the expense of printing the Prayer-book, and some Tracts, in the Tamul language. But unless this be done, it must be evident, that no great and lasting good can be accomplished at Madras, by this amiable and excellent man, in comparison with whom there are indeed but few, whose exertions are even worthy of notice. The Members of the Fellowship Fund of the United Unitarian Congregations of Loughborough and Mount Sorrel, deserve great praise for their conduct on this subject. They have set an excellent example; which, would the other Fellowship Funds but follow it, something might yet be accomplished worthy the wealth and talents of the Unitarian denomination. But till then we must be content to be the laughing-stock of every other sect, and reprobated, deservedly reprobated, for the want of that zeal and that benevolence, without which the purest principles are of little avail.” (Discourses, Appendix, p. 74.)

Such is Unitarianism. The whole Christian world is now intent upon the great work of evangelizing the heathen. England, in particular, is pouring forth her wealth, and sending

forth her sons, to aid the cause. Meanwhile a congregation professing the "pure and uncorrupt" doctrines of Unitarianism makes its appearance on the Malabar coast. These poor Indians stretch forth their imploring arms to their British brethren, saying, "come over and help us."—Appeals are made to the feelings and to the pockets of the party. And what is the result? The great cause of truth, of "pure and uncorrupt" truth, stands still for want of one missionary and 500*l*.! Even stimuli fail to excite. The members of one Fellowship Fund set the example. The members of others do not follow it.—We apprehend there is no great zeal in the leader of the Madras congregation, William Roberts. He writes that he received a letter and a parcel of books on the 8th (or 9th) of April; but adds "I had no leisure to attend at the Chapel before the 3d of May." Thus nearly a month elapsed after he had received the parcel from England. And then he "read the contents of the letter to his brethren in Tamul, and showed them the books." Henry Martyn, we think, would not have done so. This William Roberts is the person who is afterwards spoken of, in the above extract, as the "amiable and excellent man, in comparison with whom there are indeed but few, whose exertions are even worthy of notice:"—a bitter sarcasm, on the part of Mr Harris, upon the members of the Unitarian connexion. The cause of all this failure and coldness is well pointed out in a small tract, connected with the present controversy, which has lately come before us. "Could they not then sacrifice a few pounds a year (the only expense they were at) in propagating their views?" (The circumstance alluded to is the stoppage of a publication that came out in numbers.) "If they could not, they at once tell us the fate of their cause, and the real spirit by which they have been actuated in separating from other societies. Success requires efforts or labour. Labour is expense. A cause that does not warm the blood of its friends, and raise the mind to a real love to God and their neighbours, cannot afford that expense, and therefore fails." (Dialogue between a Free-thinking Christian and a Minister. Preface.)

We must here refer, also, to a striking defect in Unitarian discourses; namely, that they frequently consist, almost entirely, of matter totally unsuited to the pulpit. We have before us, for instance, a sermon preached at Norwich on the day of the interment of his late Majesty, by Thomas Madge, which consists of little more than political discussion. The following extracts read more like passages from a newspaper, than parts of a discourse delivered from the pulpit.

"We have glorious reigns ending in holy alliances—misnomer be-

getting misnomer, and delusion gathering upon delusion. Holy alliance, forsooth! as if that alliance could be called holy, otherwise than in ridicule and in sport, which is nothing else than a base conspiracy against the rights and liberties of free-born men."

"I cannot call that reign a glorious reign, the greater part of which has been spent in waging war against the liberty and independence of those, who had as much right to be free and independent as ourselves. Victories we may have gained—splendid victories, by sea and by land—but to what have those victories led?" (P. 27.)

This is what we must look for from Unitarians. When we find controversy substituted for religion, we may generally expect faction for politics. A popular candidate for Westminster might borrow for the hustings from many of their discourses.

But we think the point to be especially noticed in Unitarian writers, is a deficiency in that particular in which they consider themselves most eminent—we mean a deficiency of intellect. This we consider a singular and very observable infirmity, extensively pervading the party. We shall dwell upon this subject at some length, specifying various particulars which have led to our conclusions upon the subject, and requesting the reader to remember all along, that our object is not merely to expose infirmity, for of that we all partake; but to expose the glaring combination of arrogance and weakness.

One common token is a *constant habit of laying great stress in argument upon what is admitted by the opposite party*. Unitarian writers are for ever insisting upon conceded truths. Thus Mr. Yates devotes a chapter (part ii. chap. ii.) to "The Evidence for the Unity of God from the Testimony of the Scriptures," well knowing, all the while, that the Divine Unity is a doctrine of the general Church. In the same manner we find Unitarians constantly spending their labour in proving the humanity of Christ, a doctrine which they might find asserted to their hearts' content in the Athanasian creed. Dr. Wardlaw justly animadverts on this mode of proceeding. Speaking of a book published by a Unitarian, he says—

"Respecting this little work, I have only time to say, that a great proportion of it, especially what regards the unity of God, and the humanity of Jesus Christ, contains proofs of what nobody denies. . . . We assert that in the unity of God there is a distinction of persons:—we are met by proofs of the unity of God. * We assert that Jesus Christ was God as well as man:—we are encountered with multiplied evidences of his humanity. The true points of difference on these subjects are thus completely evaded. . . . It is not enough to say, that the work only professes to contain a statement of Unitarian principles. The object of it is to show that these principles are *scriptural*; and it is addressed to the friends of free inquiry. But it is, from the nature of the case, impossible for a Unitarian to prove his principles on these

subjects *scriptural*, except by proving that the principles of Trinitarians are *unscriptural*. It ought to be his business, instead of *proving the Unity of God*, to *disprove the Trinity*; instead of *proving Christ's humanity*, to *disprove his divinity*. If he can do this, he will have done every thing:—but till he has done this, he has done absolutely nothing, except having deceived his readers." (Reply, p. 317, note.)

Here then is one token of a weakness of the rational faculties in the Unitarian controversialist. He argues away with all his might, but perceives not that he is gaining nothing but what is granted to him. Like a child on a rocking-horse, he rides full gallop, but perceives not that he is making no advance. He gains, indeed, in one way. For, by the very act of arguing for admitted truths, he conveys an impression to the uninformed, that his adversary opposes those truths. This impression, meanwhile, is often totally false. Thus,—with regard to those two doctrines to which we have particularly referred, and for which Unitarians argue so stoutly, namely, the unity of the Godhead, and the humanity of the Saviour,—not only are they *allowed* by the general Church, but explicitly stated, insisted on, inculcated, as of immense importance to the Christian scheme. The only question, as we shall see before we have done, is, whether after all the Unitarians themselves really hold them.

A very similar weakness to that we have mentioned, is the following. The Unitarian will occasionally *attack some point which his opponent does not concede, and yet such that if he gain it he in fact gains little or nothing; and will then triumph as if this barren victory had decided the contest*: much in the same way as Napoleon asserted that he had gained the battle of Waterloo, because his troops, in the early part of the day, carried a position in advance of our lines. We have already noticed an instance of this, exposed by Dr. Wardlaw. Speaking of Heb. i. 10, Mr. Yates observes, that the only question is, "Whether this quotation was intended by the writer *as an address to Christ*?" And he endeavours to disprove this by 'a disquisition on the word *προς*, the object of which is to show, that *Προς τον Υιόν*, in the 8th verse, does not mean "unto the Son," but "concerning the Son." Now, we say, grant this. Grant that *προς* means "concerning" and not "unto." The concession makes no difference whatever. Still the words in the 10th verse are an address, and can be nothing but an address. We have, indeed, here, a strange obliquity of intellect. Mr. Yates sits down contented with his victory over *προς*, and forgets that the words which follow still stand in the Bible, to the utter confutation of his system, an address to the Son of God, declaring his proper deity in characters of light, and proclaiming it to the whole world with a voice clear as that of a trumpet.

Many, indeed, are the barren victories of Unitarianism. The question in such cases, if there be any, is whether a victory has actually been gained by them. But, granting even a partial degree of success in some instances, as far as regards the establishing of a particular point, we are sure, after all, to find, that their success is of no use to them. This is shown in several examples by Dr. Wardlaw. This gentleman, in his Discourses, produces 1 Thess. iii. 11—13, as a passage in which "Jesus is acknowledged in connexion with God the Father as ordering the events of Providence." Mr. Yates turns to Griesbach, and finds the words ὁ Κυριος (the Lord), in the beginning of verse 12, marked as doubtful. He observes, therefore, that if they be omitted, the passage will read thus: "Now God himself and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you, and make you to increase and abound in love one toward another," &c. (P. 226.) But, as Dr. Wardlaw justly asks, what material difference as to the *argument* is made by this omission? (Reply, p. 264.) It still is true that, in this passage, "Jesus is acknowledged in connexion with God the Father as ordering the events of Providence." Thus even the victories of Unitarians are unprofitable. And when they have proved all that they want to prove, it turns out that they have proved nothing.

Another instance of intellectual weakness appears in a constant propensity of Unitarian writers, in controversy, to commit that error in logic which is called *petitio principii*, or "*begging the question*." This is an error, indeed, to which all reasoners are liable; it being exceedingly difficult to avoid sometimes taking that for granted which we believe to be true. But the error positively pervades the writings of Unitarians; which, for the honour of their intellectual claims, ought to be totally free from it. When we come to examine their arguments, we constantly find them resting on an assumption of that which is to be proved. We have an instance of the *petitio principii* (we do not mean to say only *one*) in Captain Gifford's "defence." In proof of the Unitarian doctrine, he quotes Rom. xi. 36. The words in the Bible are, "Of him, and through him, and to him, are all things." But the gallant officer gives the passage thus. "Of him, and through him, and to him (*the Father*) are all things." (P. 14.) Now we call this a *petitio principii*, because we are not willing to use a harsher term. The writer, then, finds it asserted of "the Lord" (verse 34) that "Of him, and through him, and to him are all things;" and assumes that by "the Lord" is meant "the Father," to the exclusion of the Son: inserting the words "the Father" not with any intention of deceiving, but merely with the intention of conveying the impression which is upon his own mind. But we say, this is the

point that requires to be proved. *We* might assume, that since "the Lord" is spoken of, Jesus Christ is signified. *We* might give the passage thus: "Of him, and through him, and to him (Jesus Christ) are all things." But would this be fair? Far from it, in argument: though, in point of fact, we believe it would be correct. For we might go further, and argue that the words "the mind of the Lord," in verse 34, prove that the Saviour is signified. If we turn to 1 Cor. ii. 16, we shall find that there will be some difficulty in distinguishing between "the mind of the Lord," and "the mind of Christ." The "improved version" will not help the gallant officer here.

In the same manner we find Mr. Yates, as Dr. Wardlaw points out, assuming that our Lord claimed and received honour *only* as the ambassador of the Supreme God; (Vindication, p. 218;) which is begging the question: assuming that the distinction between the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ, is the distinction between the true God and a being commissioned and qualified by him; (p. 228;) which is begging the question: assuming that the Unitarians give the exact translation, and only admissible meaning of a certain disputed passage; (p. 239;) which is begging the question: assuming that the word *God* signifies simply *one* person, or intelligent agent; (p. 57;) which is begging the question: assuming that the title "Son of God" does not imply our Saviour's equality with the Father; (p. 90;) which is begging the question.

We find another token of weakness on the part of Unitarian writers, in a kind of *conscious hollowness*, which is continually betraying itself. This appears,—in cases where there are two or more points, either of which being proved, the other follows of course,—in their insisting with all their might upon each: as if they sometimes felt an obscure misgiving of their inability to prove either one or the other satisfactorily. They fly from one to the other, because they can maintain themselves in neither. For instance: we find them at one time using what may be called external arguments against the doctrine of the Trinity; such, for instance, as reasonings about passages of Scripture which are alleged in proof of it: but at another time flying off to internal arguments; arguments, we mean, drawn from the doctrine itself; such as that it is mysterious, that it is impossible, and the like. And we have appeared to ourselves to trace in them, when urging the external objections, a tacit concession, or at least a consciousness, that their internal ones were insufficient; and when urging their internal, their external. Thus a man who has the gout in both feet, and is forced to stand, first puts his weight upon one, then upon the other. The reason is clear. Neither is able to support him The Unitarians *must*,

from observations which we have made, we say it with confidence, they *must* sometimes have misgivings of the hollowness of their cause. What, for instance, must have been the state of Mr. Yates's mind, when he wrote the following passage? It relates to the answer of Thomas when he saw our Lord after his resurrection, and after having refused to believe the assurances of the other disciples. "Thomas answered and said unto him, MY LORD AND MY GOD." Mr. Yates writes thus:

"Leaving every reader at full liberty to judge for himself, and retaining the right of changing my opinion, if at any future time I shall see fit, I only remark upon this passage without stating all my reasons, that these words appear to me to have been addressed by Thomas to Christ, and may be justly considered both as an *exclamation* expressive of his wonder and delight, and also as a *confession* that Jesus was his lord and his god. But it is needless to dispute, that, when Thomas addressed Jesus as his lord, or master, and his god, he might mean only, that Jesus was his *inspired instructor in matters of religion*. Agreeably therefore to the principles, which have been before stated, his words ought to be understood according to this simple and reasonable interpretation." (P. 176.)

For our own parts, when we read this passage, we experienced a melancholy feeling. Our less serious readers, perhaps, will smile at such a helpless effort to escape from the truth. Others will see an occasion for their prayers, and join them, we trust, with ours.

But, to proceed to other instances of mental imbecility, we have detected in the writings of Unitarians various *misrepresentations*. A character of misrepresentation, indeed, pervades both their writings and their system. This we are willing to attribute to intellectual hallucination, and therefore we give the subject a place in our present catalogue.

The first instance of misrepresentation which we shall offer is from the sermon of the Rev. Joseph Hutton, of Leeds, already quoted. This gentleman cites the following passage from St. John (xvi. 23) as a proof that believers are not now to address Christ in prayer. "In that day ye shall ask me nothing. Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you." On the strength of this passage he makes a solemn appeal to the conscience of the Trinitarian, (which will do well enough if the said Trinitarian does not understand Greek,) respecting the expressions found in the Litany of the Established Church, in which prayer is offered to Christ. (P. 76.) But when we come to turn to our Greek Testament, we find the words are—"ἐμε οὐκ ἐρωτᾶτε οὐδέν—ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσῃτε τῷ Πατρὶ." Our translators have used the word "ask" in both cases. But the true English of the passage is this. "In

that day ye shall inquire nothing of me whatsoever ye shall request (or require) of the Father," &c. *Ἐρωτα* here means to ask a question, *αἰτω* to prefer a petition. The words of Schleusner on this passage, under *ἠρωτα*, are these: "*Interrogando scrutator et percontor.* John xvi. 5. 23. *ἡμε ἐκ τῆς ῥωτῆσεως οὐδὲν, habebitis idoneam et perfectam scientiam.*"

Therefore to allege the passage in question as a proof that we are forbidden to prefer our requests to Christ, is a total misrepresentation. The whole meaning of the words, "In that day ye shall ask me nothing," amounts to this:—that whereas the disciples were continually putting questions to Christ, some of them disrespectful, some of them needless, some of them unbelieving, the time was at hand when they should do this no more. As to the idea that the disciples were not to *pray* to Christ, it is further excluded by the following passage from John xiv. 13, 14: a passage peculiarly calculated to illustrate that given already, but kept entirely in the back-ground by Mr. Hutton. "Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, THAT WILL I DO, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask any thing, in my name, I WILL DO IT."—"τοῦτο ποιῶ—ἐγὼ ποιῶ."

Another Unitarian writer, Richard Wright, in a sermon called "The resurrection from the dead an essential doctrine of the gospel," endeavours to prove that the neglect of this doctrine, "by reputed orthodox Christians," is "an argument against the truth of their system." One of the *propositions* of this gentleman is, (for he makes his approaches in form,) that "The doctrine of the resurrection from the dead is so fundamental in the true evangelical system, that, strictly speaking, without it there is no gospel." And he objects to "the reputed orthodox system" that, in it, "a future life is neither dependant on, nor necessarily connected with, the resurrection from the dead; for it supposes man to be naturally immortal." (P. 18.) The inconsistency, then, which we have to notice, is this:—that our author dwells incessantly upon 1 Cor. xv. as proving that we have no reason to expect a future life on any other ground than a resurrection, as proving that St. Paul himself did not expect "a future life, independently on a resurrection from the dead;" and yet, that when we turn to this very chapter, we find it most explicitly and distinctly stated, that some *will* partake of this future life, "independently on a resurrection from the dead." "Behold, I show you a mystery. WE SHALL NOT ALL SLEEP, BUT WE SHALL ALL BE CHANGED." (Verse 51.) What can be more unaccountable, more contradictory than this?—To refer us to a passage in proof of a doctrine, which passage, when we come to examine it, is found to overthrow the doc-

time completely. And to astonish us to the utmost, we find these words in a bracket at the end of the very section in which the doctrine is maintained:—"The reader is requested carefully to examine 1 Cor. xv. referred to throughout this section." (P. 12.) But this is not all. The author gives a reference also to 1 Thes. iv. 18: and, behold, when we turn to it, we find the verse immediately preceding containing the following words:—"Then *we which are alive and remain* shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and *so shall we ever be with the Lord.*" A passage which, if there were no other to the same effect in the Bible, would of itself totally overturn the doctrine of any *necessity* for our first dying, and being raised from the dead, in order that we may live for ever.

Another misrepresentation is the following. Dr. Wardlaw, in his Discourses, gives us to understand that he regards the term *mystery* "as signifying something that is either difficult to be conceived, or entirely incomprehensible." (P. 19.) But ~~this~~ definition does not suit Mr. Yates. Accordingly he proposes the following: "A mystery is a proposition, to the terms of which no distinct ideas are annexed." (P. 39.) This he has a right to do. If a man does not like another person's definition, he may have one of his own. But Mr. Yates does not stop here. He makes his own definition Dr. Wardlaw's. "He has substituted his own definition for mine," says the Doctor, "and has *made it mine*, by inserting it in my argument, where mine should have stood." (Reply, p. 56.) That is, he has gone on arguing, page after page, as if Dr. Wardlaw's definition and his own were identical, which they by no means are.

Another very great misrepresentation, common to many Unitarian writers, is their mode of speaking of Griesbach. In order that their readers may not be deceived, it is essentially necessary that they should understand two things—first, that Griesbach's edition of the New Testament has by no means materially shaken the authority of the received text of that volume; secondly, that Griesbach himself was not favourable to Unitarianism. We do not mean to say that Unitarians have directly *asserted* the contrary of either of these propositions. But this we say,—that no uninformed reader can make himself very extensively acquainted with their writings, without receiving a totally false impression both with respect to one and the other.

First, then, we allege, that Griesbach's edition of the New Testament has by no means materially shaken the authority of the received text of that volume. We might rather say, it has, in the main, very satisfactorily established its authority. Let

us listen to Professor White, in the preface to his "Criseis Griesbachianæ in Novum Testamentum Synopsis." He thus concludes.

"Ex quo jam poteris (id quod imprimis in animo habui) facillimo negotio intelligere, quam sit salvus et integer *Novi Fœderis Textus*, qualem nunc se habet, in omnibus quæ ad veram interpretationem *Fidei et Officiorum* pertineant; et quam leves sint cæ in quavis alia parte mutationes quas recipere ille vel debeat vel possit." (P. iv.)

Salvus et integer—safe and sound.—What can be more satisfactory?

Secondly, we allege, that Griesbach was not favourable to Unitarianism. To his belief in the Divinity of our Lord, he himself deemed it necessary to bear the most explicit testimony.

"Interim uni tamen dogmati, eique palmario, doctrinæ scilicet de vera Jesu Christi Divinitate, nonnihil a me detractum esse videri posset nonnullis qui non solum locum illum celebratissimum, 1 Joh. v. 7, e textu ejectum, verum etiam lectionem vulgarem loci, 1 Tim. iii. 16, (ut et Act. xx. 28,) dubitationi subjectam et lectorum arbitrio permixtam, invenient. Quare, ut iniquas suspiciones omnes, quantum in me est, amoliar, et hominibus malevolis calumniandi animum præripiam, primum *publice profiteor atque Deum testor*, neutiquam me de veritate istius dogmatis dubitare. Atque sunt profecto *tam multa et luculenta argumenta et scripturæ loca*, quibus vera Deitas Christi vindicatur, ut ego quidem intelligere vix possem, quomodo, concessa scripturæ sacræ divina auctoritate, et admissis justis interpretandi regulis, dogma hoc in dubium a quoquam vocari possit." (See Reply, p. 31.)

"For my own part," he says, "I can hardly conceive how, supposing the Divine authority of sacred Scripture to be granted, and just canons of interpretation to be adopted, this doctrine can by any one be called in question." This is the gentleman of whom Mr. Yates says, "Above all, the Christian world is indebted to the learned, impartial, and indefatigable Dr. Griesbach:" adding of his edition, that it "is at present received every where by the learned as the standard text of the Christian Scriptures." (P. 27.) Mr. Yates does certainly let it out that Griesbach was a Trinitarian. But, by the way in which he parades him for three or four pages together, one would take it for granted that, at the very least, the Unitarians found in him a most valuable ally.

Some instances of misrepresentation, which we are compelled to offer, amount almost to *actual falsehood*. This principally appears in bold but groundless statements respecting passages of Scripture. The immediate cause, even here, we conceive to be rather an obliquity of mind, which blinks the truth, and

aimed at carrying away the minds of others by imposing representations, than a conscious purpose of base and fearless misstatement.

Our first example will be drawn from Mr. Marshall's "Letter." This gentleman makes the following assertion. "There is only the *sound* of one text which *seems* to set forth Christ's equality with the Father." (P. 35.) Now this we assert to be positively untrue: and, in proof of our assertion, shall offer a few passages of Scripture, without meaning to allege that none of them have been disputed (however groundlessly); but reminding our readers that the question is about their "*sound*," and about what they "*seem to set forth*."

"I and my Father are one." (John x. 30.) "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father." (xiv. 9.) "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." (i. 1.) "This is the true God, and eternal life." (1 John v. 20.) "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." (Heb. i. 8. A quotation from Psalm xlv. כִּסֵּאךָ אֱלֹהִים עוֹלָם וָעֶד.) "As the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." (John v. 21.)

Be it observed, we are not entering upon the field of controversy in offering these passages. The question is simply about a matter of fact. Mr. Marshall asserts that "there is only the *sound* of one text, which *seems* to set forth Christ's equality with the Father." We assert that this is untrue: and in proof of our assertion we appeal to the texts above cited, as we might to hundreds besides.

But there is one subject upon which Unitarians seem to consider themselves in a manner privileged to misrepresent the truth; and that is, the disputed text of the three Witnesses. Of this text they are in the habit of speaking, either as if it were given up by all their opponents without exception, or as if all of them, who do give it up, surrendered it as notoriously interpolated. Now this is not true. There are unquestionably strong arguments against the authority of the text. Many Trinitarians have doubted it—many have surrendered it—a few have even renounced it in very unqualified terms. But even these last have by no means spoken of it as *notoriously* forged. Griesbach excludes it indeed from his text. But even he has thought it necessary to write a treatise on the subject. He does not treat the matter as one on which there are not two opinions. Some merely decline using the text in argument. Some state that they have attended to the arguments both for and against it, and think the latter preponderate. These facts by no means bear out the bold and unqualified assertions of the Unitarians; espe-

cially when we bear in mind that, after all, some very weighty arguments are alleged in favour of the text. Let us listen, now, to the language of the Unitarians.

Mr. Yates speaks of the text, as "that falsely attributed to St. John." (P. 37.) Mr. Hunter speaks of it as "a text which every body now knows never proceeded from the pen of that apostle." (P. 30.) Rather more cautious language, but language equally calculated to mislead, is employed in the introduction to the "Improved Version."—"Of these" (wilful interpolations) "the last-mentioned text, 1 John v. 7, is by far the most notorious, and most universally acknowledged, and reprobated." (P. xxv.) Mr. Worsley says, "Many of the most learned advocates of the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity, both in and out of the Church, have admitted the fact, after a fair and honest inquiry into the matter, *That the text of the three heavenly witnesses is a gross and a palpable forgery.*" (P. 66.)

Now, who that had not an opportunity of examining what has been written upon the subject would think, after reading these extracts, especially the two first of them, that there was any room for a dispute about the text in question? Who would think that there was any thing to be said in its favour? Who would think that there were two opinions upon the subject? Yet such is the fact.* And not merely so. But the text is

* Doddridge, in his "Family Expositor," thus expresses himself respecting the text in question.

"I thought myself obliged to intimate such a remaining doubt at least, concerning its authenticity, as I have done by enclosing it in *crotchets*. I am persuaded the words contain an important truth; but whether they have been added by some, or omitted by others, contrary to the *original copy*, I will not pretend to determine." (Note, in loc.)

Macknight states the arguments on each side; and, though he declines giving a decided judgment, urges several considerations in favour of the authenticity of the text: among the rest, the following.

"This verse, properly interpreted, instead of disturbing the sense of the verses with which it is joined, rather renders it more connected and complete." (Note, in loc.)

Guise, in his "Practical Expositor," argues decidedly for the text: observing, among other things, that "it is much more likely that some transcriber might, through the similitude of the beginning of the seventh and eighth verses, or through some obscurity in the writing of that part of his copy, carelessly slip over the seventh, than that any should be so daring as designedly to add it to the text." (Note, in loc.)

Scott observes:—"It is, however, perhaps, somewhat more likely that the Arians or Anti-Trinitarians should silently omit, in their copies, a testimony which was so decisive against them, or that it should be left out by mistake of some ancient transcriber; than that the Trinitarians should directly forge and insert it." (Note, in loc.) He acknowledges, however, some doubts of the authenticity of the passage towards the end of the note.

Macknight observes concerning Mill:—"These arguments appeared to Mill of such weight that, after balancing them against the opposite arguments, he gave it as his decided opinion, that in whatever manner this verse disappeared, it was

actually maintained by many to be authentic. Much has been written to prove its authenticity; aye, and ably written, and learnedly written, and, as some think, convincingly written. We shall not obtrude our own opinion; but the advocates of its authenticity certainly conceive that they have a good cause. Mr. Horne, for instance, in his book which stands at the head of our article, refers, and refers with confidence, to Dr. Hales's "*Faith in the Holy Trinity*," as settling the question: of course in a very different way from that in which the Unitarians represent it as settled. Mr. Horne himself briefly enumerates some of the leading arguments in favour of the text in the following manner. And, we must say, we think there is much weight in his statement.

"You will, perhaps, be told, (for it has been repeatedly asserted, though not clearly proved,) that the latter part of this verse, as well as the former part of the following or eighth verse, is not genuine; that it is not cited by any ancient fathers of the Christian Church, and consequently, that it is no proof of the doctrine of the Trinity. But we know that it is found in one manuscript of the Greek Testament, though not a very ancient one, and also in several ancient versions. It is likewise quoted by many early fathers of the Christian Church: and, for the silence of those who have omitted to cite it, very satisfactory reasons have been given, which the limits necessarily assigned to this Discourse do not allow to be stated. It is, moreover, worthy of remark, that the fathers, who have quoted this text, were never charged with interpolating it by the false teachers of their time, who opposed the doctrines embraced by the Catholic or Universal Church of Christ; and whose silence, in this respect, is a strong testimony in favour of the genuineness of the disputed clause. Further, this clause is found in the confession of faith of the Greek Church, as well as in the ancient liturgies of the Greek and Latin Churches: and, when the lasting and hitherto irreconcilable schism which has prevailed between those churches ever since the fourth century is considered, this fact forms a strong and conclusive argument in favour of its genuineness: for such is the enmity between those two communions, that, we may rest assured, the Greek Church would never have adopted the clause merely on the authority of the Latin, if she had not had sufficient vouchers or testimonies for it in her own original Greek manuscripts. The grammatical structure of the original Greek also requires the necessary insertion of the *whole* of the seventh verse, and consequently that it should be received as genuine; otherwise the latter part of the eighth verse, (the authenticity of which was never

undoubtedly in St. John's autograph, and in some of the copies which were transcribed from it." (Note already quoted.) "

We would have it remembered that we give these extracts, not with the view of establishing the authenticity of the contested passage, but with the view of showing how total the misrepresentation, when the question is spoken of as decided against it.

questioned, as indeed it cannot be, being found in *every* known manuscript that is extant,) must likewise be rejected; and lastly, the connexion of this disputed clause requires its insertion, inasmuch as the sense is not perfect without it." (P. 8.)

Such are the arguments in favour of a text, (we do not give them as either conclusive or unassailable,) which one Unitarian author, in the most unqualified manner, asserts to have been *falsely* attributed to St. John; and which another designates as "a text which every body knows never proceeded from the pen of that apostle." Hence we may learn how far the positive assertions, contained in Unitarian writings, are to be depended on.

But it will be asked, why mention these misrepresentations as tokens merely of imbecility? Are they not tokens of something worse? We answer, because, as we have already intimated, we really view them in the light of tokens of intellectual weakness—of culpable weakness certainly. The falsehood, it appears to us, arises from the writers not attaching due weight to the words which they employ, which is always a token of a weak mind. Thus it is observable how often children utter what is untrue; and that principally from a habit, a very culpable one no doubt, of exaggeration; a desire to make you think what they want you to think; a wish to convey their ideas and impressions into your mind, at any expense of misrepresentation and hyperbole. No doubt when the writers, above quoted, made those unwarrantable statements, they felt as if they were only using a little excusable rhetoric, an allowable figure of speech. Unhappily the same culpable imbecility of mind which appears in these falsehoods, appears also throughout the Unitarian scheme, and more fatally displays its effects in a habit of undervaluing the terms of the Bible, and, in consequence, the doctrines of salvation.

We discover another token of mental weakness, in the *confusion of things different*. Thus the Unitarians frequently confound mystery and absurdity. In the same manner we find them confounding faith and conviction, or rather annihilating faith. For their notion seems to be, that nothing can be an object of faith but what is seen and thoroughly understood: whereas such things are not objects of faith, but matter of certainty. The confusion here seems to arise from a certain laziness of mind, which prevents its giving itself the trouble to acquire an idea of either what is mystery, in contradistinction to absurdity; or what is faith, in contradistinction to conviction. And this laziness is a proof of weakness.

Our next instance consists of what, for want of a better name, we must call *platitudes*, borrowing a term from across

the water. By a *platitudo* we mean an extreme carelessness or inaccuracy of argument or expression, amounting to something very like absurdity. But perhaps an example or two will best explain what we mean.

Dr. Wardlaw, having cited 2 Thes. ii. 16, 17, remarks that the evidence which he draws from the passage is particularly strong from the circumstance of Jesus being put *first* in the order of address. Mr. Yates observes on this argument, and a similar one founded upon 2 Cor. xiii. 14, that, at the utmost, it "rests on very dubious ground. It is the idiom of the *English* language, when a verb has more than one nominative, to place that first which is considered the highest in dignity and eminence. In *Latin* the rule is the reverse; the most important object being mentioned *last*. Whether there be any established practice upon this subject in *Greek*, I must confess myself at present unable to say;—but I do not take Mr. Wardlaw's rule upon trust." (P. 227.) Suppose, then, our Saviour to be a created being, inferior to the Father,—suppose the "established practice" in *Greek* to be the same as in *Latin*, "it would follow, inevitably, that our Lord would invariably be placed first. But how stands the fact? He is almost always *last*, having only in two or three instances the precedence." (Reply, p. 261.) Here then, we think, Mr. Yates has lost himself. If there be any force in his argument, it proves only what he would be most anxious to disprove: namely, that our Lord's name, in ninety-nine instances out of a hundred, occupies the place of peculiar dignity. Not that we conceive this to be the case; we know that our Lord, though "equal to the Father as touching his Godhead, is inferior to him as touching his Manhood." And therefore, if any inferiority is implied in some places where he holds the second place, our system suffers not from it in the least. But we mention the obvious inference to expose the *platitudo*—the striking incautiousness and infirmity of argumentation.

Again—a question arises concerning the phrase, "calling upon the name of the Lord:" a question which involves a point of no less importance than this—whether our Saviour be a proper object of Divine worship. Mr. Yates tells us that he has spent a whole day in examining all the passages where the word (*ἐκκαλεσθαι*), translated "to call upon," occurs; and adds, "In the evening I rest from my labour, with a persuasion that much may be said on each side of the question; and, instead of being able to form a very decided opinion, I am inclined to consider this as one of the difficulties left in revelation, for the purpose of inculcating humility and candour." (P. 223.) It appears, then, as Dr. Wardlaw observes, that for the sake of inculcating

the virtues of humility and candour, the readers of revelation are to be left in uncertainty, and at a loss to ascertain, whether Divine worship be due to Christ; or whether, in offering it, they are guilty of idolatry. Certainly Mr. Yates must have a strange conception of the Christian revelation, if he regards it as leaving those to whom it is addressed, *purposely*, at a loss to determine who is the proper object of religious worship. (See Reply, pp. 253, 254.) This is a decided *platitude*.

We have found more than one example of the same figure, if we may so call it, in Mr. Worsley's book. In one place, he is labouring with all his might to prove that the festivals of our church had their origin in heathen feasts and holidays. Here and there he succeeds in tracing a resemblance. At length he comes to the first of May, and endeavours to identify the feast of Ceres and Flora, kept on that day, with the festival of St. Philip and St. James. The following is part of his demonstration. "When we consider the festive processions which were but a short time since customary upon this day, and are still observed in some places, with rural dances and garlands of flowers, it is easy to see the suitableness of these things with the feast of Flora, *but it is not possible to discover any relation which they can have with St. Philip and St. James.*" (P. 14.) The question then suggests itself at once:—Why does he endeavour to connect them? A similar question may be asked when he endeavours to identify our Christmas with the feasts of Saturn and Bacchus. "The Carols," he says, "formerly sung at this season were not as they are now, where they are continued, religious songs bearing an allusion to the birth of Christ: they were songs, calculated to enliven the merriment of the festival, they were bacchanalian songs." (P. 16.) This is a most exquisite *platitude*. If the things were different, why attempt to identify them? We see no room for any comparison, except the comparison of contrast. But to come to particulars:—"The Carols formerly sung at this season were not as they are now, where they are continued." The Carols—formerly sung at this season—were not—as they are now—where they are continued! How shall we analyze the manifold and mysterious beauties of this clause? The well-known dialogue between the two Frenchmen is nothing to it. "Did it rain to-morrow?" "Yes, it was."* To find any

* So also the cry of the Irish watchman on the night that ushered in the fifth of November, comes far short:—

"To night's the day, I speak it with much sorrow,
When we were all to have been blown up with gunpowder to-morrow.
So take care of fire and candle light,
'Tis a cold frosty morning, and so good night."

things that at all approaches to a parallel, we must look a little further on. "None but himself is his own parallel."—"We learn that the ancient Danes were great toppers: and, to encourage the habit of tippling, when any one had transgressed the customs of the court, he was punished, by being obliged to drink a bumper out of a large horn, kept for that purpose in the palace." (P. 18.) These *great toppers* were punished, by being *obliged to drink a bumper*. There is much of the "*curiosa felicitas*," there are many recondite graces, in this sentence. As we view it in different lights it sparkles with all the colours of the rainbow, like a diamond in the sun. But it certainly does not quite come up to the last.

Towards the end of his book Mr. Worsley argues that "the repugnance of the philosophic gentiles to a suffering Saviour opened the way for the exaltation of his nature, and for regarding the attributes he received from his Father as properly his own." (P. 61.) That is, it was found difficult to bring the gentiles to believe in a suffering man. And the only resource was, by way of making the matter easier, to exalt him into a suffering Divinity.

We thought we had met with one example of the *platitude* in the work of the gallant officer already quoted:—when he speaks of various "heterogeneous constituents" as being "compounded into one indiscriminate mass" by the "agency" of "solvents." (P. 35.) But our readers will perceive that the expression, a little considered, will bear a meaning, and has nothing contradictory. We are glad, for the honour of the service, that our nautical opponent has steered clear of the rock on which so many Unitarians split.

But perhaps the most remarkable specimen of the *platitude*, is to be found in the sermon by Mr. Joseph Hunter. Towards the end of it he thus speaks. "I have abstained, in the sketch which has been given of Unitarianism, from the use of Scriptural language, lest I might be supposed to use terms to which some ambiguity of meaning might be said to attach." (P. 29.) Now this is rather an odd speech for a Unitarian. Writers of this class are fond of urging the necessity of expressing the doctrines of Scripture in Scriptural language only. They attack us about our creeds and our articles: because they are made up of clauses and sentences not taken out of the Bible. Some Socinians have even gone so far as to assume the uncouth term of "Bible-only Christians." But here, unwittingly, is a concession of the whole point in dispute: and we have Mr. Hunter's authority, if we required it, for abstaining from the use of Scriptural language, "lest we might be supposed to use

terms to which some ambiguity of meaning might be said to attach!"

Now perhaps it is not worth while to waste many words upon these *platitudes*. They are little more, it may be, than casualties—mere errors in expression. It will be said, too, that they are excusable, and ought not to have been noticed. In the ordinary business of reviewing we should have scorned to notice them. But the "rational Christian" must not be let off so easy. When the *platitude* occurs in the writings of one whose boast is in his reason, the case becomes different.

Another flaw or two we must yet proceed to mention. We refer to the constant recurrence of *inconsistencies*, of various kinds, in the writings of Unitarians. Some of these we shall now specify.

Mr. Yates observes that when God appears to Abraham he thus speaks. "I am the Almighty God; walk before *me*, and be thou perfect." Whereas, to represent the address of more persons than one, the following language would have been employed; *We* are the Almighty God (or Almighty Gods); walk before *us*, and be thou perfect (P. 58.) That is, as Dr. Wardlaw observes, "he states the language which *would be used* if a plurality of persons were intended; and yet, when such language is used, he refuses" (and so do all Unitarians refuse) "to admit that it has any reference to plurality at all, and endeavours to explain it as *the language of majesty*." (Reply, p. 94.)

Again. Mr. Yates maintains that the angel in the Revelation, who refused worship from the apostle, was Jesus himself. (P. 219.) But, if that be the case, "alas!" says Dr. Wardlaw, "for the principle on which Socinians are accustomed to explain other instances of worship offered to Jesus." (Reply, p. 252.) This principle is, that Jesus might be worshipped when he was visible, though not when he was invisible. Wretched as such a solution is, "this notion of Mr. Yates, about Jesus being the angel who so peremptorily refused the worship of his fellow-servant, sweeps it clean away. So that, after all, by what he labours so hard to establish, he would lose at least as much as he could gain."

Another inconsistency we find in Mr. Yates's first censuring Dr. Wardlaw for his exceptions to certain high authorities, and then "humbly presuming to differ from them himself." (See Reply, p. 171.) "How," he says, "does Mr. Wardlaw reply to their observation? First, by his manner of printing their proposed translation;"—(with two marks of admiration)—"as if the most learned and respected theologians, who ever

wrote, were to be confuted by sticking up a few marks of admiration.—Secondly, by charging them with ignorance of Greek, and “a glaring departure from the established practice of Greek syntax.” The man who with unhesitating dogmatism prefers such accusations as these even against Grotius and Samuel Clarke, is of course infinitely above my notice.” (P. 180.) Who would conceive, after this, that Mr. Yates would differ from these very authorities, on the very subject on which Dr. Wardlaw differs from them? Yet such is the fact. “The want of a parallel form of expression inclines me to prefer the common translation.” (P. 181.) Such is his deference for “the most learned and respected theologians, who ever wrote.”

These are single instances. But we shall now mention certain inconsistencies which are of a more extensive nature, and pervade the Unitarian system.

One inconsistency appears in the cry raised by Unitarians for “the Bible, and nothing but the Bible.” We have already seen how far one of their writers is willing to apply this principle of theirs when it comes to practice. But this is not all. The Unitarians are dissatisfied with the received version of the Scriptures. Accordingly, they publish a version of their own. But do they proceed upon their own principle? Do they give us the Scriptures without note or comment? The Bible, and the Bible only? Far from it. The very title-page announces a New Testament with notes “critical and explanatory.” Nay, the last edition comes to us, “with corrections and additions.”!!! Oh rare! A New Testament “with corrections and additions” from these “Bible-only Christians.” Then come eight and twenty pages of introduction, advertisement, and appendix, to be turned over before we come to the “Bible only.” And when at length we arrive at the text, we find it extending through 626 pages;—from which our readers may guess how much space, at the bottom of this “Bible only,” consists of notes and comments. The fact is, that the version cannot stand alone. They dare not trust it to go alone. They are obliged to send it forth with “corrections and additions,” introduction, advertisement, and appendix, notes and comments, to look after it, and keep it from falling.

There is another thing in the conduct of Unitarians, totally inconsistent with their professed deference for the Bible, and the Bible alone. The final authority of the Bible is ever in their mouth. Yet when we come to the point, when we produce our texts out of Scripture, when we bring them into the light of Scripture, immediately they begin to struggle and reel. The wriggling of an eel when fairly hooked by the an-

gler, is the only thing to which we can compare the wriggling of a Unitarian when "hitched," as Pope says, upon a passage of Scripture. This Bible, which they talk of with so much deference as the Bible and the Bible only, when we come to the trial, we find not to be decisive with them. They have an appeal beyond it to their reason, i. e. to themselves. Every man of them has his criticism, has his interpretation, has his gloss and his evasion. They take the trouble to argue against the quotations of their opponents as if they really thought them important, while the real fact lies plain and palpable upon the surface, namely that they slight the book. We fearlessly assert the fact. Scripture is not decisive with Unitarians. Whatever particular writers of the party may profess, we deny that the Bible is to Unitarians a final authority. Press them hard with a passage when you find they are at a loss to answer it.—Follow them up close when their confusion begins to be evident.—What course do they pursue? Why, they turn round boldly upon you at once, and deny the authority of the passage to your face. It must be interpolated, or corrupt, or a mere figure, or an orientalism: (~~or~~ because it contains a doctrine that they do not like.) Or, if it be none of these; then, "the old apostle dictated one thing, and his amanuensis wrote another." The avowed and brazen infidel stands naked and detected.

We might mention also another inconsistency of the Unitarians, in their pouring contempt upon the authority of tradition and of the early fathers, yet continually endeavouring to prove that both are on their side. This is an evidence, also, of that conscious hollowness of which we spoke before.

Another instance, and one which may be classed with the last, is found in their conduct with respect to creeds. They are constantly decrying creeds, and that upon general principles, involving, one would think, an objection to all creeds: such as that they are human devices, that their phraseology is not scriptural, that they shackle the human intellect, and the like. Yet they sometimes speak with great clemency of the composition commonly called the Apostle's Creed; nay, even allege it, as in their favour. How shall we explain this? How comes it that objections, which apply equally to all creeds, are totally forgotten when we come to this creed? Suppose we were to tell them that there exists another "Apostles' creed." We mean a very ancient composition bearing that title, as well as the one commonly so called, (it is given by Mr. Horne, p. 158,) but in many points resembling the Nicene creed, and containing an explicit statement of some of those doctrines which they reject. And suppose we were able to make out by

some unlooked-for authority, that this was the true and ancient Apostles' creed (as it is called). We doubt not they would endure the Apostles' creed no longer.—The truth is, that the composition generally bearing that title, though it contains by implication all the doctrines which Unitarians deny, was not worded with a particular reference to their errors, as some others were; and therefore they assume that it is for them.

So also we find the Unitarians denying the authority of names in general, yet insisting on it when it suits their purpose. There is no class of controversialists who are not glad to cite all the names they can in their favour. *They*, alone, stand conspicuous in doing it, who decry the practice. For instance, the Unitarians are constantly alleging the authority of Griesbach, and that in such high terms of commendation, and we might almost say of personal affection, (in consequence, we suppose, of his having excluded certain Trinitarian clauses which we can do without,) that one would have supposed him to be their warmest ally, instead of being their declared opponent. So also Mr. Belsham quotes the name of Priestley with deference, and Mr. Yates that of Mr. Belsham. Yet neither of them, we apprehend, has much respect for that of Horsley. We find Mr. Marshall treating Bishop Beveridge with no small contempt, calling him ironically a "*sensible prelate*," and imputing insincerity to Lord Bacon (pp. 9, 10;) yet quoting a remark by "a celebrated critic in the Hebrew language (Dr. Geddes)" as an answer to an argument, (p. 26,) and afterwards appealing to another "celebrated critic (Blaney)." (P. 30.)

Indeed the names that are thus cited are often those which are not calculated to make any great impression by their weight or authority. Mr. Belsham, as may be seen in the tenth article of our thirteenth number (p. 241,) refers us to "Gregory Blunt:" and Captain Gifford speaks of that "learned controversialist"—"the Rev. John Marsom;" boasting that of "such defenders" the cause of Unitarianism "has never been wanting." (P. 22.) What would the gallant officer say, if we were to imitate the practice of his friends, by first pouring contempt upon our wooden walls, and, then, pointing to a revenue-cutter or a gun-boat, and saying, old England has never wanted such defenders?

An instance, to which we have already in part alluded, of a further and fatal inconsistency, may be found in the quotation of the names of persons decidedly opposed to Unitarianism. As the authority of Griesbach is so often insisted on by Unitarians, let it be remembered what were his real sentiments with regard to the leading topic of the controversy. They have been given already. We ask, therefore, if we are to defer to Griesbach

in regard to his view of one or two passages, why are not Unitarians to defer to Griesbach in regard to his view of the whole Bible? If we are to defer to some particular passages or expressions that seem favourable to Unitarians, coming to us with the authority of respected names, why are not they, *à majori*, to defer to the whole tenor of the same persons' sentiments, when it is adverse to Unitarianism? Nay, instances may be given, where the passage quoted actually contains something totally adverse to the impression which it is intended to produce. Thus Mr. Yates quotes a passage which is intended to convey to us the high opinion which Dr. Parr entertained, when he wrote it, of Dr. Priestley. The passage, however, begins thus.—“Let Dr. Priestley indeed be confuted, where he is mistaken; let him be exposed, where he is superficial; let him be repressed, where he is dogmatical; let him be rebuked, where he is censorious.” (P. 22.) At another place Mr. Yates says, “In opposition to Mr. Wardlaw's representations, let the candid Trinitarian consider the following account of the manner, in which Unitarians argue, written by one of the best men, who ever entered the lists against them.” This account (from Tillotson) contains the following words.—“Upon the whole matter, they have but this one great defect, that they want a good cause, and truth on their side.” (P. 163, 164.)

There appears, also, some inconsistency in the conduct of Unitarians, when we compare their positive, and peremptory, and decisive way of speaking, upon points at issue, with that candour, and that suspension of judgment, and that allowance for the opinions and the reasons of others, of which they would be thought so fond, and which they seem to regard as one of the characteristics of their party. Thus we find Mr. Yates complaining of Dr. Wardlaw, that he “has never put his mind into that state of calm and impartial deliberation, which is necessary to collect and arrange the proofs on either side, and to judge in favour of which opinion the evidence preponderates.” (P. 3.) He speaks of expedients which “are utterly subversive of that temper of cool, patient, and unbiassed investigation, which may be expected in one, who makes it his ‘simple and exclusive object’ to ascertain truth.” (P. 4.) Yet, as we have already seen, does Mr. Yates himself speak of the disputed text of the three witnesses, as “that falsely attributed to St. John;” and, immediately after, of that other disputed text “God was manifest in the flesh” as “that falsely attributed to Paul.” (P. 37.) Shall we call it a spirit “of calm and impartial deliberation,” a “temper of cool, patient, and unbiassed investigation,” which dictated these expressions?—To these

specimens we may add all the instances of dogmatism already mentioned, when we were speaking of the contested text in St. John.

We may notice an inconsistency, also, in two modes of speaking of the great points at issue between Unitarians and the general church, totally at variance with each other. If we understand Mr. Yates, it is to these points that he alludes, when he speaks of "those unmeaning sounds and frivolous disputes, which had been magnified by ecclesiastics for their secular advantage." (P. 253.) Yet, in his introduction, does he speak of the question between him and Dr. Wardlaw, as one "which is without doubt the most important of all topics in controversial theology." (P. iv.) Mr. Harris speaks of "counties which are yet enveloped in the darkness, the gross darkness, of reputed orthodoxy." (P. xi.) Mr. Marshall uses the following expressions. "The irreverence, Sir, is in the system of your irrational church: a system whose doctrines originated in a dark age, in a polluted church, and were established by *act of parliament* at a time when Biblical knowledge and criticism were indeed an infant science." (P. 25.) We quote the following words from Mr. Yates, not with the intention of imputing them to him as now standing under his name, (for in his second edition he seems to have withdrawn them,) but as illustrating that other mode of speaking which we meet with in Unitarians, and which we have already noticed at the beginning of the present article. "I think it probable, that the chief effect produced by this controversy will be a conviction, in the mind of candid and sensible judges, that the differences of sentiment between the two contending parties, are much less than is commonly supposed." (See Wardlaw's Reply, p. 378.)

We have, also, another inconsistency. They believe their own principles of investigation to be the only ones which will lead to the discovery of truth:—the consequence of which should be, that they all should hold one opinion:—for, if they all know the truth, there could be no difference of opinion. Yet this is so far from being the case, that they acknowledge and admit of divisions among themselves. Thus Mr. Yates alludes to certain "subordinate questions, concerning which they differ among themselves," (p. 7,) and says that "they allow a variety of opinion upon minor topics." (P. 5.) Would we know what are these "subordinate questions," and these "minor topics," let us listen to the Unitarians themselves. "Whether the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures be a doctrine of the Christian religion;" (Vindication, p. 15 :) whether "our Saviour existed before his human birth in a state of great glory," or never existed till he was born into the world; and whether he was

miraculously conceived, or actually the son of Joseph; (Unitarian's Appeal, p. 2:) whether his death had "some" or no "effect" in reconciling God to man: whether there be "an ever-active tempter of mankind to evil," or no such being: whether we are to "look for annihilation as the portion of the wicked," or to "regard them destined to infinite and irreversible misery;" (Hunter's Sermon already quoted, p. 28:) or whether we are to believe "that future punishment will be *corrective*, and that finally all will be saved—all will be recovered—made holy and happy;" (Unitarians not Infidels, a Sermon by John Platts, p. 5:)—these are some of the "subordinate questions," and "the minor topics," upon which Unitarians differ among themselves! We might here pause, and assert at once, that it lies plain and palpable upon the surface that those who regard themselves as of one persuasion, where there are such differences, and yet speak of their varieties of opinion as trifling, must be totally in the wrong.—Strange, that the same persons should represent the whole general church as lost in error, thus holding themselves up, as it were, for infallible; and yet should agree to differ among themselves, and make it a part of their system, to have no settled views on these all-important points.

We shall here, also, notice a practical inconsistency, very observable in many Unitarian writers, in the two-fold mode of treatment which they adopt towards their opponents; sometimes scurrilous, sometimes even pompously courteous and polite; sometimes speaking of them as respectable, sometimes as despicable; sometimes complimenting, sometimes reviling them. What we mean to say is, that these two modes of treatment are adopted by the same Unitarian writers towards the same individuals. This is quite inexplicable. Mr. Yates, for instance, speaks of Dr. Wardlaw, as a man for whom he entertains "a very high esteem and warm attachment." (P. 1.) Yet, presently after, he charges him with "a kind of *management* and *generalship*, which a Votary of Truth would scorn." (P. 4.) "Mr. Wardlaw's discourses have been honoured," he says, "as they deserved, with great attention and countenance." (P. 2.) Yet, at page 174, he talks of certain writers, "in opposition to whom *Mr. Wardlaw's* assertions, and even Dr. Middleton's, are not worth a rush:" speaks of "the feeble diminutive accents of our worthy author" being drowned by the "mere names of Origen and Eusebius:" and adds, "I shall for a few moments detain his remarks from the concealment into which they are fast tending." Thus also we find Mr. Harris dealing with his opponent Mr. Philip. "It gives the author sincere pleasure to state that Mr. PHILIP, with that candour and liberality which ought ever to distinguish a lover of truth, has requested him to

notice, that he has apologized for, and explained his error, in substituting," &c. (Preface, p. v.) Here one would think the whole business was made up and forgotten. But far from it. New causes of dissatisfaction arise, and mention is made in the preface to the second edition of Mr. Harris's book* (p. x.) of "the gross blunder which defaced the pages of" Mr. Philip's "former publication." "Nor can any adequate apology be made for such a gross blunder, by a man who held himself forth," &c. This is strange, when an apology had already been offered and accepted: especially as it is to be gathered, that the "error" in the one case, and the "blunder" in the other, were the same. With similar inconsistency Mr. Marshall expresses "a hearty wish" for the CONVERSION of his antagonist, and, immediately after, recognizes him as his "FELLOW-LABOURER IN THE GOSPEL." All this is done in one sentence, the last of the epistle. "And now, Sir, with an expression of respect for your seriousness, your zeal, and sincerity, and a hearty wish for your conversion, I abruptly finish my letter, somewhat alarmed at its length: and remain, Sir, your very humble servant, and fellow-labourer in the gospel, W. Marshall." The first sentence of this extraordinary epistle is no less remarkable, considering that it is addressed to a person in an unconverted state. "Rev. Sir, I address you in consequence of your notice of my 'Letter to Trinitarian Christians;' and I do it with a sentiment of respect, from a conviction that I am addressing myself to a Christian gentleman." We have heard of a Presbyterian Papist. But we never heard before of an "unconverted Christian gentleman." Those of our readers who have read the "Sermons" of the clergyman in question, but, above all, those who have the happiness of his private acquaintance, will find little difficulty in deciding which two of these three terms may be most appropriately applied to him.—Mr. Marshall having, as we have seen, addressed his opponent "with a sentiment of respect" at the beginning of his letter, seems to have experienced a total change of sentiment before he comes to page the eighteenth. "There is no human mind, Sir, can make the monstrous supposition... without a sense of the grossest fiction and falsehood. Your system of divinity, Sir, makes this supposition; and it rests with you to remove (as you can) the load of absurdity with which your barbarous, Hindooish dogma...incumbers the New Testament."

We might mention an additional instance. We have a Unitarian pamphlet before us in the form of a letter, purporting to be an answer to a tract written by a minister of the Establishment. This pamphlet is scurrilous in the extreme, in its reflections upon the gentleman in question: yet on the outside of the

copy lent to us we find an address in handwriting of the following form. "To the Rev. A. Z., AM. with the author's respectful compliments."

We might extend our illustrations of the inconsistencies of Unitarians, to their two-fold manner of speaking of existing institutions and established authorities: sometimes submissive, sometimes contumacious; sometimes respectful, sometimes rancorous. One would think their feelings and their principles were equally unsettled.

Indeed, the Unitarians have two styles of writing totally inconsistent with each other. One is that which they endeavour uniformly to maintain in their defences and apologies, intended for the public eye. Here the Unitarian, making his appeal from the bigotry of his orthodox opponent to the candour of the world in general, would be meek, candid, and temperate. He assumes the tone of one deeply injured, and deeply sensible of his wrongs. But every now and then he forgets himself: he breaks forth into a different style, and shows himself in a different character. In an instant a change takes place, and he stands forth in the grim lineaments and gaunt proportions of staring, truculent infidelity. We are at first startled at the change. We hardly know our man. But taking a little time for consideration, we soon recognize the bold, indignant, scurrilous Unitarian.

These are some of the inconsistencies of the party. And while they support us in our opinion, already expressed, that the writers professing this persuasion have in general no settled views, they offer a farther proof of that mental imbecility which we have already imputed to them; and of which, in a greater or less degree, indeed, most persons who have the faculty of observing the operations of their own minds must be conscious; but which we consider a peculiar and very prominent characteristic of the Unitarians.

Various such proofs have we enumerated:—such, for example, as their dwelling so much on what is admitted, their triumphing so much where there is no victory, their *petitio principii*, their conscious hollowness, their misrepresentation of sentiments and facts, their confusion of things different, and their platitudes and inconsistencies of various kinds:—the whole constituting, we think, an evidence of a defect of reason, and evincing an intellectual deficiency, as a very general characteristic of this class of writers.

Here then we are led to pause, and to offer a few reflections. The Unitarians, it appears to us, afford a remarkable proof of the imperfection of the human mind. In the perusal of their writings, we are continually meeting, in the midst of much that

is plausible, with some grand defect or flaw, which common sense ought to discover and common tact avoid; some gratuitous assumption, some totally false view, some radically defective representation of the sentiments of their opponents. Errors and inadvertencies of this kind, not one of us, perhaps, can be sure of avoiding. Something of the sort might very possibly be detected in every author that ever wrote. But the time for noting them especially, is when they appear in the writings of those who bear the title of "*rational* Christians." Such persons we find approaching the discussion of sacred things with a boldness and a confidence, which seem to proclaim that their understanding enters as it were erect into the presence of the Deity. The cause of this unhallowed boldness we conceive to be, the minds' dependance on its own powers. The understanding, ever on the search for work, finds it in approaching the contemplation of divine things, and rushes eagerly on this new and expansive field of occupation. But here it soon loads itself with a greater weight than it can bear, and sinks beneath the burthen that it has assumed.

While we see men trusting so much to their reason as the Unitarians, yet committing from time to time such glaring blunders, both logical and practical, an object is certainly gained in the Divine economy. There is undoubtedly no style of error, no class or order of persons, that does not answer some purpose in this grand system. The Jews, for instance, to this day are testimonies of the truth of God. We may look to them, and learn in their present circumstances, that what God has threatened he will certainly accomplish. So also, something may be learned from the Unitarians. They also answer a purpose in the scheme of Divine government. They may serve to humble the pride of man. In them we behold a standing evidence of the infirmity of human reason. The Unitarian we regard as an awful and affecting monument of the imbecility of man, when alienated, by an overweening confidence in his mental powers, from the Author of his being. And at the same time we recognize in him a state of the intellectual faculties, which, while it moves our pity, and humbles us in our view of our common nature, leaves an opening for charitable hope, and an encouragement for our prayers.

We must now notice a gentleman of the name of Gosnell, the author of "*An Examination of the various Texts of Scripture said to support the Doctrines of the Trinity and the Atonement, adduced by the Rev. Thomas White,*" &c. This gentleman lets us know that he "*has the honour to be a member*" of the church of "*the Free-thinking Christians*:" (p. 4:) and therefore he is not a Unitarian. It is curious that Mr. Marshall, in

his letter to Mr. White already cited; represents the persons calling themselves "Free-thinking Christians," as "allies with Churchmen in speaking evil" of Unitarians: saying, "You abuse the Unitarians, Mr. White, by 'mixing' them up with 'Free-thinking Christians,' &c." (p. 37 :) yet that this "Free-thinking Christian" joins with Mr. Marshall in attacking the Churchman. And, on a little examination, we shall find traces of a nearer resemblance than the Unitarians may feel willing to allow. The only material point of difference which we have observed, is that which respects the judgment of the world by the Saviour. This, after a manner, Unitarians in general admit. Mr. Gosnell, on the other hand, seems in effect to question whether there ever will be any judgment. "I am fully persuaded," he says, "all the expressions used in Sacred Writ, relating to the punitive dispensations of God, are mere figures of speech, tending to show that He rules over all." (P. 20.) In our Bibles we find the following passages. "He that doeth wrong, shall receive for the wrong which he hath done." (Col. iii. 25.) "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." (Ezek. xviii. 4.) "The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." (verse 20.) "Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book." (Ex. xxxii. 33.) "The face of the Lord is against them that do evil." (Ps. xxxiv. 16.) "There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." (Isaiah lvii. 21.) "If thou forsake him, he will cast thee off for ever." (1 Chron. xxviii. 9.) "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God." (Ps. ix. 17.) "Our God is a consuming fire." (Heb. xii. 29.) "Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord." (Rom. xii. 19.) "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth: they that have done good, to the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, to the resurrection of damnation." (John v. 28, 29.) "Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." (Matt. xxv. 41.) "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." (verse 46.) Then comes Mr. Gosnell, and tells us he is fully persuaded, that "all the expressions used in Sacred Writ, relating to the punitive dispensations of God, are mere figures of speech!!!"

But we proceed to other particulars. We trace a point of resemblance between Mr. Gosnell and the Unitarians, in his mode of making assertions, totally groundless, about disputed passages of Scripture. Thus, respecting 1 Tim. iii. 16, he asserts it to be "generally admitted" (p. 29) that the name of the Su-

premise Being "is not in the original." This is untrue. The point is a matter of dispute: by no means a matter of general admission. In the same spirit Mr. Gosnell alleges, that the two first chapters of Matthew, and the two first of Luke, "are acknowledged to be forgeries." (P. 31.) Now this is very far from the truth. The fact has been *asserted*, indeed. But this is as far as possible from its having been *acknowledged*. Such a statement is as great a misrepresentation, as if a man having a suit at law with another asserted the deficiency of certain deeds of material importance to the cause, and then, upon the strength of this assertion of his own, alleged that the defect had been acknowledged by the opposite party.

We have traced, also, another point of coincidence with Unitarianism. The following passage is a specimen of *petitio principii* at least, if not of *platitudo*. Mr. Gosnell speaks of certain doctrines, "the mysterious nature of which appears sufficient to render them suspicious, if not untrue." (P. 39.) This gentleman may imagine that mystery proves a religious doctrine to be untrue. But we should rather say, the absence of mystery would prove it. Our notions certainly differ very widely from his. To us it would appear the most unaccountable thing that could be conceived, human nature continuing such as it is, if a revelation of divine things were to come to us, and not involve some mystery. But, a little before, we find the following amazing assertion: "The definition given of the word Mystery in Scripture, is the explication, unfolding, or making plain, something that was formerly not clearly known, or darkly expressed." (P. 16.) This idea seems to have arisen out of some misconception of Rom. xvi. 25, 26, where a mystery is spoken of, which had long been kept secret, "but now is made manifest" and "made known." That is, the mystery is made manifest and made known. But this is as far as possible from the mystery itself being a making manifest or a making known. As well might we define a plot to be the discovery of a plot; or a trick to be the finding out of a trick; or darkness to be the departure of darkness. And when we had gone so far, we might proceed a little further, and define night to be day, or call black white, or say that sun-set was sun-rise.—A patent has lately been taken out, which we would recommend to this gentleman. It is for a contrivance called the fumivore. This ingenious device he must certainly have recourse to, before he makes a second attack upon Mr. White. His style will be somewhat clearer when he has learned to burn his own smoke.

At another place we meet with a full-formed and perfect specimen of the *platitudo*. Mr. Gosnell affirms (p. 28, 29,) that the expression, "God our Saviour," (Tit. i. 3,) does not mean

Jesus Christ. And for what reason? Because in the next verse we find the expression, "Jesus Christ our Saviour." How would it confirm our author in his views, were he to turn to the second and third chapters of the same epistle. He would there find the expressions, "God our Saviour," "the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ," "God our Saviour" again, and "Jesus Christ our Saviour," in the compass of a few verses. And to settle him in his views, it is only necessary to inform him, that the true English of the phrase too cautiously rendered by our translators "the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ," (τῷ μεγάλῳ Θεῷ καὶ Σωτῆρι ἡμῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ,) is "our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ."

It will rather surprise the Hebrew scholar that this gentleman, (p. 39,) quotes Isaiah xli. 20, "The Holy One of Israel hath created it," (יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּרָאָהּ, the argument, we suppose, resting on the word "One,") as a proof of the unity of the Deity; and the Greek scholar, that he quotes John x. 41, "all that John spake of this man is true," (πάντα δὲ, ὅσα ἔειπεν Ἰωάννης περὶ τούτου, ἀληθὴ ἦν,) and John xv. 24, "If I had not done among you the works which none other man did," (Εἰ τὰ ἔργα μὴ ἐποιήσα ἐν αὐτοῖς ἃ οὐδεὶς ἄλλος πεποιήκειν, the argument resting on the word "man," in both cases,) as a proof of that other point which no member of the general church ever denied, the manhood of our Lord. Hence, however, they will be better prepared for our author's mode of disposing of John i. 1. Instead of reading "The Word was with God," (ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν,) he proposes that, "by a little transposition of the words," we should read, "God was with the word," (p. 28,) a mode of rendering the passage truly worthy the attention of the editors of the "Improved Version."

And now, having entered into these statements and exposures, we must be permitted to say that we have not gone out of our way to look for them;—except, indeed, that what has been said respecting the member of the church of the Freethinking Christians may be thought a digression. Those who are acquainted with Mr. Wardlaw's two very able publications, will perceive how highly we stand indebted to him. For the rest, —we have looked over a few Unitarian publications at random, a great part of them, if not all, taken on the recommendation of the shopman at the place where such books are sold; and in these, without any other search than that of reading them through, we found the specimens which we have offered, and which, to us, are only confirmatory of our previous opinions. The search has left some serious impressions on our mind. Perhaps a peculiar style of error might be traced in every class of unbelievers. We think there is something marked in that

of Unitarians. We find them often going on very well for a time. Much that they say seems really to the purpose. We once met with a short passage of great beauty in a well-known writer of this class, which we have given in a former number. They can talk plainly, sensibly, at times even scripturally. They express themselves as if they felt strong, and quite at home in their subject; and were satisfied that they had reason, and all the reason, on their side: so that an uninformed reader, taking up one of their publications, of those at least which are put forth for the purpose of making out a case, will wonder that so much should ever have been said against them. But then all at once something comes out, as we read on, so glaringly wrong, or so unaccountably perverse; so palpably feeble, or so totally inconsistent; that we recognize at once the melancholy state of the afflicted person. Thus, when we are talking to a patient in St. Luke's, for a long time he is quite reasonable. He is exceedingly reasonable. He is particularly reasonable. Knowing the malady imputed to him, he takes express pains that all he says shall be reasonable. We begin to wonder that so reasonable a man should ever have found his way into such a place, or that any reasonable man should ever have put him there. But all at once he breaks out into something that in a moment convinces you of his unhappy case. Thus have we observed, in one of these writers, considerable ability in his attempts to fix a charge of not preaching the gospel upon the general church. All is regular and in its proper place. His plan of attack is ingenious, and his mode of conducting it skilful. He first gives his propositions, and then his expositions. But then, in the midst of all this, we detect the strange and glaring blunder of referring his readers to two passages of Scripture in support of his views; to one of them urgently, repeatedly, and triumphantly; on the very surface of each of which passages lies a total confutation of his whole argument. This prevailing defect, indeed, may be mentioned, as common to our Unitarian assailants:—that such of their assertions as, if true, would fix a charge, are not made out; and that such of their assertions as are true, fix no charge whatever.

We have not yet said much in a direct way on the subject of infidelity. But it will be seen on what footing we regard our opponents. To say the least, there is certainly a good deal of coquetry going on between them and professed unbelievers. The line, we fear, between the two parties is not very distinctly marked. And there are reasons for suspecting that there is much passing and re-passing from one side of it to the other. "I have had the misfortune," says a Unitarian minister, "to witness the departure of many from the Christian path into the

dreary wilds of gloomy scepticism and everlasting doubt." (Letter to a Young Man, by the Rev. J. Platts, p. 5.)

And, on the other hand, we learn from a sermon by the same author, what indeed is no secret, that avowed infidels attend Unitarian places of worship.—"It is said 'Avowed infidels attend our places of worship.' The fact is this: The cause of infidelity is in a state of rapid decay; its oracles are nearly dumb; its veterans are completely foiled. Abashed and confounded, it dares not appear in its own proper shape and colour. Under these forlorn circumstances, the wandering disciples of unbelief, the votaries of the mysteries of infidelity, have taken advantage of the candour and liberality of the Unitarian Church, and have sought protection from it." (Unitarians not Infidels, p. 10.)

It will be seen how this gentleman attempts to account for the fact; but the true cause, we conceive to be, that there is nothing in the doctrine of Unitarians to keep these infidels away. "They are of the world: therefore speak they of the world, and the world heareth them." (1 John iv. 5.) No such stigma can ever attach to a true church. Never can its doctrines be relished, or for any length of time endured, by infidels. Nor can the pure and unperverted gospel, while the world continues what it is, though the multitude will sometimes crowd to its faithful ministration, be ever, in any good sense of the word, popular. "If ye were of the world, the world would love his own. But because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you." (John xv. 19.) On the part of the unbelieving there will always be a natural hostility to the truth; and the Church, as well as her Leader, may say, "I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not. If another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive." (John v. 43.)

In all that we have said, we wish it to be understood that our object has not been so much to expose intellectual weakness as to humble intellectual pride. The infirmities which we have noticed are such as we are all liable to, Trinitarians as well as Unitarians. Let both parties, then, learn a lesson of humility. Let not the most faithful think that he has any greater strength within himself than the unbelieving; but let him feel, more than ever, his need of aid from the Spirit of that God and Saviour, by faith in whom he stands.

With regard to the two excellent publications of Mr. Wardlaw, we have read them with much attention: and a high opinion of their merits will induce us to be rather particular in mentioning a few objections which struck us in the perusal.

In the first place, we are not quite clear as to the good gene-

relationship of his plan of contracting his lines of defence. What we refer to, his own words will best explain.

"It has frequently struck me as a defect of considerable magnitude in some of the treatises which have been published on the subjects handled in this volume, particularly the Divinity of Christ, that the writers have lessened the effect which their works are designed to produce, by attempting more than enough. . . . They have, with the laudable view of showing how full the Bible is of the particular doctrine they defend, exerted their ingenuity, with various success, in bringing texts to bear upon it, of which the application is dubious, or, even when satisfactorily ascertained, by no means impressive. . . . It has been my aim, in the following Discourses, to avoid this defect." (Discourses, preface, p. iii. iv.)

It ought to be said of no text, of which the application, as proving the Divinity of Christ, is "satisfactorily ascertained," that it is "by no means impressive." But, not to dwell upon this point, we confess we do not like the idea of giving up so much ground to the enemy, which is strictly Trinitarian. It may be thought convenient in controversy. It may have been supposed that there are various ways in which the mode of conducting the argument, objected to above, "is fitted to hurt the cause in which it is employed, and to afford an advantage to its adversaries." (P. iv.) But we very much doubt to what degree even this is really the case; and it is a question with us, whether we ought to give up an inch of the ground that is committed to us. The defence of a besieged place assumes rather an unfavourable aspect, when the garrison abandons all the out-works and retires to the citadel. We can offer no better proof that this is not the wisest plan, than that Mr. Yates is vastly delighted with it, and commends it highly.

"Mr. Wardlaw has shown peculiar judgment in confining himself to those arguments, which have usually been considered as clear and decisive, instead of bringing forward all the passages of Scripture, which have been conceived to bear remotely upon the subject, and by insisting upon which other advocates have weakened the cause they intended to support." (Vindication, p. 3.)

This is not the kind of tone that Mr. Yates is accustomed to employ, when his "friend" has him up in a corner, and turns him the seamy side out.

It appears to us, also, that Mr. Wardlaw, in the caution which he has learned from his acquaintance with the ways of Unitarians, has sometimes been too apprehensive of exposing himself to objections.

"I shall avail myself," he says, "of the language of two other writers, who have expressed themselves with that modest discretion, which is so becoming in creatures on all such subjects; but which is

galling to the adversaries of the doctrine, because it does not furnish them with grounds sufficiently gross and palpable, to enable them to shock and horrify the minds of their readers, by burlesque, and ridicule, and bold unqualified asseverations of the nonsense and absurdity of Trinitarianism." (Reply, p. 71.)

Now, as to all this, we shall only say that no vindicator of the truths of Christianity ought to care for it one farthing. We know the doctrine of the Trinity is a mystery after all. And, with all our moderation, and all our caution, if we state it faithfully, still it will be of such a kind that obloquy and ridicule may be attached to it. As specimens of "modest discretion," Dr. Wardlaw gives quotations on the subject from Dean Swift and Venn. There is a wide difference, we apprehend, between the statements of the two writers. Swift's, we take it, is Sabelianism; at best, one degree removed. He is flinching throughout from the appearance of contradiction; and states nothing but what any person may believe, without in any way submitting his reason to revelation. Mr. Wardlaw's motive for giving this extract from Swift seems partly to have been, to show that defenders of the Trinity are not always rash and extravagant in their statements of the doctrine. And this object the quotation may answer, if the title of a defender of the Trinity can be given to its author:—but certainly not that of affording a satisfactory statement of the doctrine itself. At any rate we venture to ask,—will caution of this kind, after all, satisfy the Unitarian? Will it stop out all occasion of ridicule? Will it leave no opening for the enemy? We believe that this would not prove the case even with Swift's view of the doctrine: much less with Venn's; which we take to be, on the whole, a faithful, though exceedingly guarded statement. As boldly, and specifically facing the difficulties of the case, however, we like much better than either the following quotation given by Dr. Wardlaw from Gousset. It relates to the plural form often employed in the Old Testament, in speaking of the Deity.

"Ex his sequitur PLURALEM DE DEO LOCUTIONEM PROPRIE AC IN TOTA VI SUA SUMENDAM, ut idiomatis Ebraicæ linguæ obtemperetur; ideoque fatendum esse illam PLURALITATEM IN DEO DISERTISSIME ET VALIDISSIME ASSERTI." "At inquis, pluralitati isti obstat Dei natura. Ego, contra, qui scis? Plus valet locutio Dei qui scit, quam ratiocinatio tua, qui nescis. Regeris, sunt aliæ causæ pluralis locutionis. Ego repono, PROPRIA ET NATURALIS EJUS CAUSA EST RERUM INSIGNITARUM PLURALITAS: ex ea venire solet pluralis forma nominis, nec efficaciori modo illa indicari potuisset quam locutione ista et diserta et solenni. Omnis ergo humilis verbi Dei discipulus, quid ille dicat, bona fide, excipere studens acquiescat."—"The plural form of speech concerning God, is to be taken strictly and in its full force."—"Plurality in Deity is most distinctly and strongly

affirmed."—The "proper and natural cause" of this mode of speaking "is plurality in the things signified." (Reply, p. 88, 89.)

The real difficulty and the real mystery of the Trinity we apprehend to be, that it includes an apparent contradiction. And the effort really required of our faith we apprehend to be, to believe that this apparent contradiction is not real. He who has not seen the question in this light, has never, we think, acquainted himself with its real difficulties; has never once led up his mind to the contemplation of the true turning point of the controversy; has never had a single view of the jet of the case. The difference between mystery and absurdity is generally represented to be, that the one is above reason, the other contrary to reason. But we should rather state it to be, that the one seems to be contrary to reason, the other is so; or, that the one is opposed to human reason, the other to the nature of things; or, that the one is opposed to human reason, the other to the divine reason. It will appear by these various definitions, to not one of which, perhaps, some plausible objection might not be made, that we are of opinion that a thing may be contrary to human reason, and yet not contrary to the nature of things, or to the divine reason.—But few Unitarians will acclaim to this. Mr. Harris quotes a passage from Mr. Watson's "Remarks," (which expresses, in rather strong terms, the sentiments that we have just been advocating,) with some tokens of indignation.

"What rational evidence, except that they are doctrines of a revelation from God, is there of the Trinity, or of the union of two natures in one person in our Lord? It is of small consideration whether the doctrine in question be to me reasonable or not. The doctrine of the Trinity in Unity stands upon no rational evidence of the doctrine itself. I have no hesitation in saying that the doctrines of the Trinity in Unity, of the union of two natures in one personal Christ, not only transcend, but contradict human reason. It is, to my mind at least, a very strong argument, *à priori*, against any scheme, that it renders a doctrine of pure revelation less difficult to reason. All such doctrines, as to human reason, whether they are contrary to it, or transcend it, are in their nature difficult, and difficult because they are true—and (startling as it may appear to those who pay so much homage to the efficiency of their reason,) difficult in proportion as they are revealed." (P. 14.)

We must mention, also, that we think Dr. Wardlaw assigns a very insufficient motive for his hesitation respecting the doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son from the Father, and the eternal procession of the Spirit from the Father, and the Son. "The principal source of my hesitation respecting the common opinion above mentioned, was a desire to clear that

great and fundamental article of my faith" (the doctrine of the Trinity) "from plausible objection." (P. 340.)

We only half like this "desire to clear." Bring us a doctrine which is not liable to "plausible objection," and we will venture to say, without looking at it, this is not the doctrine of the Trinity. Whatever system we adopt; whether of belief or of unbelief, we must come to difficulty at last. Shall the difficulties, then, from which we shrink, in preference, be the difficulties of revelation?

We have of late, also, from having looked more into the nature of the question between the general Church and the Unitarians, learned to feel somewhat of uneasiness, whenever, in statements of the doctrine of the Trinity, any thing is said which amounts to an intimation, or admission, that the word "person," as used in stating it, is materially objectionable. We say materially objectionable, because, to uninstructed minds, the word certainly may appear to convey ideas that are not intended. Where the word occurs it is usual, with writers on the Trinity, to intimate that it is employed for want, of a better. But, for our own parts, we like the word very well. Accordingly, we did not quite approve of Dr. Wardlaw's mode of expressing himself, where he intimates that, "in the Unity of the Godhead there are three distinct subsistences, which, wanting a more appropriate term, we denominate *persons*." (Discourses, p. 29, 30.) The doctrine of the Trinity is confessedly a mystery. It is therefore, to say the least of it, a doctrine not understood. How then can it be *confidently* said that *any* term usually employed in stating the doctrine is *inappropriate*? The mode of the fact, we are constantly obliged to repeat in defending the doctrine, is not revealed, but only the fact itself. Such, then, being the case, how can we venture to intimate that, after all, the word "person" is objectionable. When this is done, is it intended to be signified that the fact of there being three Persons in the Unity of the Godhead, is NOT the fact revealed? Far from it, we trust.

We were not quite pleased, either, with certain departures from our received version of the Scriptures, which we met with in the earlier of Dr. Wardlaw's publications. At page 397 he gives us 1 John iii. 16, in the following form: "Hereby perceive we the love (of Christ) because he laid down his life for us." Our common translation stands thus: "Hereby perceive we the love *of God*, because he laid down his life for us:" the two words in italics not being in the original. Here, perhaps, our translators were under no obligation to insert any word whatever. But if a word was to be inserted, then we are satis-

And, from examining the context, that the one supplied by them was the best, and that it conveys the fittest illustration of the idea which was in the mind of the evangelist. The love spoken of in the next verse is "the love of God;" and, not to appeal to the disputed passage, Acts xx. 28, we need only turn to Rom. v. 8, to see Who it is that commendeth his love to us by the cross of Calvary.—At page 400, "without a sin-offering," is substituted for "without sin," in Heb. ix. 28. Some commentators, we are aware, prefer this reading;—but we southern episcopalians have a great horror of any *needless* departure from the received version. The word *ἀμαρτίας*, a little before, must surely be translated "sins;" and so Mr. Wardlaw has got it. If the article is wanting in the one case, it is equally so in the other: as it is, also, in verse 26, where we see very little reason to doubt that our translators have done right in rendering *ἀμαρτίας*, sin.—Eph. ii. 10, in our received version stands thus: "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained, that we should walk in them." Dr. Wardlaw has it—"Good works, to which God hath before ordained us—" &c. (P. 320.) The *οἷς* in the same case with *ἐργαίς*, by no means, we think, calls for this alteration, though Doddridge and Macknight are very decidedly for it. Not to mention that *ἡμᾶς* must be understood, which is a very forced construction. There is a sublimity in the received sense of the passage, which makes us unwilling to see it disturbed, especially as we believe it to be the true one.—The alteration of Eph. iii. 18, ("comprehend" to "apprehend," p. 358,) we conceive to be totally needless.—We wish it to be understood, however, that we are not objecting to these, or to similar alterations made by Dr. Wardlaw, as evidently erroneous in themselves, because there is much to be said for them, and he has often the strength of the commentators on his side: but while the received version continues the received version, we question how far it is worth while to unsettle the confidence very justly reposed in it by the public, by frequent deviations. Should the discussions which have lately arisen upon this subject lead to some temperate measure of revision, conducted with caution, and upon judicious principles, we can assure Dr. Wardlaw that we shall be among the first to hail the proceeding.

We have noticed, also, in Dr. Wardlaw's first volume, some few instances of a mode of speaking that looks like indecision; and that, upon points upon which we could wish to have seen him very decisive. His way of expressing himself originates, probably, in conscientious caution, mixed up, it may be, with

a little of that fear of giving a handle, of which we have already expressed our dislike.—We shall offer an instance or two, which will exemplify what we mean.

In the notes to the Discourses, Dr. Wardlaw discusses the import of those passages, in which it has been supposed that St. Paul questions his own inspiration. He terminates an able disquisition with these words: "Upon the whole, I am not satisfied, that there are any passages of his writings in which this apostle can be fairly considered as disclaiming inspiration." Here we suspect an erratum. The words surely should stand thus: "Upon the whole, I am satisfied, that there are no passages of his writings," &c. (P. 433.)—We shall mention two or three more errata.

Page 304. For "The Son is to be considered as sent by the Father, and the Spirit as sent by the Father and the Son:" read "The Son is sent by the Father, and the Spirit by the Father and the Son."

Page 382. In the following passage: "The depravity and guilt of mankind;—the Divinity, voluntary substitution, and atonement of Jesus Christ;—justification by free grace, through faith, and not by works of righteousness which we have done;—and the necessity and freeness of the Holy Spirit's influences, for the conversion and final salvation of sinners:—these appear to be doctrines which constitute the very essence of Christianity:"—for "appear to be," read "are."

Page 345. In the following passage: "Justification by free grace, through the righteousness of Jesus Christ, I apprehend to be the very first principle of the gospel:"—for "I apprehend to be," read "is."

Pages 310, 311. In the following passage: "the three persons in this one Godhead are represented as performing, each his appropriate part of that glorious work:"—for "are represented as performing," read "perform."

(N. B. If this passage be not corrected, it will be asked, "Does the author mean to say that this is a representation of what is not real?")

Page 220. In the following passage: "I have before endeavoured to answer, on this subject, the question, What saith the scripture?—and, at the same time, to show the reasonableness of the plan which the blessed God is therein represented as having adopted:"—for "is therein represented as having adopted," read "is therein asserted to have adopted," or, "has adopted."

But we cannot suffer this passage to pass with a correction of the erratum. There is another point to be noticed. The author speaks of endeavouring to show the reasonableness of

God's plan. Now we recoil from the idea of taking it in hand to show the "reasonableness" of God's plans. Where the poet talks of "justifying the ways of God to man," we own that, to our judgment, there is something awfully presumptuous in the expression. Where any thing is said of showing the reasonableness of God's plans, it might be taken to signify, if we were willing to adopt a harsh construction, "If I could not show them to be reasonable, I would not accede to them:"—which in fact would bring us at once to Socinianism. But we will not suppose this in the present instance. We must here take the opportunity of observing, that we have an especial dislike to attempts at "justifying," or, if we may coin a term, at *rationalizing* the doctrine of the atonement (not that we have observed any such attempts on the part of Mr. Wardlaw): because it appears to us that they generally end in a curtailing or attenuating of the doctrine itself. To accommodate a mystery to the capacity of man's understanding, and the corrupt fastidiousness of his taste, we must both reduce it from its actual bulk, and adulterate it with something of a more ordinary and earthly quality.

In the first of the Discourses, Dr. Wardlaw, speaking of the Bible, says, "If it could be shown to contain what was clearly contradictory, the discovery would be a proof, sufficiently convincing, of its not being from God." (P. 25.)

Now the idea of any thing "*clearly* contradictory" in a book of Divine origin, appears to us in itself to involve a contradiction. The origin of the book being divine, it *could* not be "shown," as the author seems to suppose, to contain any thing clearly contradictory, even if human reason were capable of deciding upon the point: because the fact of its Divine origin would be ground enough for doubting the truth of the charge. If in such a book we even discovered what we took to be a contradiction in terms, still the passage containing it could not be said to be "*clearly* contradictory," because the fact of the Divine origin of the book would compel us to question the fact of any actual contradiction: nay, rather would compel us to deny it, and convince us that no actual contradiction existed. This view of ours, indeed, is only an extension of a rule commonly adopted and applied at classical schools. A boy, in reading a passage in some ancient author, comes to a sentence, of which, after all that he can do, he is unable to find out the meaning. And accordingly he concludes it to be nonsense, or not to have a meaning. But when he applies to the master, the master says, "This is a passage in a writer of a superior mind, a man who never wrote nonsense. You may take it for granted, then, that it has a meaning, and a good meaning.

Go to your seat, therefore, and find the meaning out." This is the doctrine which is often preached at school, and it is good doctrine. It is doctrine which compels the learner to extract instruction from many a passage which he might otherwise abandon in despair. By an extension of the same principle, we must, in reading the Scriptures, lay out of the question the possibility of contradiction. We must take it for granted that the Bible is right, and that there is no contradiction in it. If we come to any thing that to us appears to be contradiction, the inference ought to be, not that the apparent is a real contradiction, and that there is any possibility of the book's "not being from God:" but that, in some way or other, the difficulty lies in our own minds.

There are passages, also, where Dr. Wardlaw makes an appeal to the Scriptures, which we know not whether to consider exculpatory or confirmatory. Thus where he says, (p. 354,) that "Every thing that is different from 'the works of the flesh' we are in the Scriptures taught to consider as resulting from the holy agency of the Spirit of God:" does he appeal to the Scriptures in order to show that if there be any thing extraordinary in this doctrine, they are to blame, and not he? And, again, where he says, "Were I to pursue this subject at full length, I should be led to an illustration of all the principles which form the Christian character, in the whole of their extensive and diversified operation;—these, according to the Scriptures, being all the result of Divine influence:" (p. 343 :) does he here refer to the Scriptures to exculpate his conduct in maintaining the opinion that these principles are the result of Divine influence? Or does he mean only, in both cases, to allege the authority of the Bible as supporting him in sentiments which he cordially believes and maintains? We have felt inclined to ask similar questions in one or two other places. We ought, however, certainly to be cautious in objecting to such expressions. We are not to forget that the phrase, "according to the Scriptures," is used by St. Paul in two successive verses, (1 Cor. xv. 3, 4,) with peculiar emphasis; and that the phrase and the emphasis are both transferred into the Nicene creed. Perhaps also it ought to be borne in mind that Dr. Wardlaw, in this contest, must have felt a constant appeal to the Scriptures to be necessary. And surely, if ever a believer has need to cling to his Bible, it is in contending with Unitarians. At the same time we are more and more convinced that wherever the Scriptures speak positively, there, a positive mode of speaking is that which best becomes us: and, if so, then, that in all such cases, every thing that comes short of this positiveness, however candid, or cautious, or unbiassed it may look, is short of what is right, is

defective, is wrong. And we have also a strong objection to that syllogistic faith, which builds itself up upon single texts of Scripture. The Christian should feel that the whole Bible is his creed. Whether obscure or clear, mysterious or simple, his faith should comprise all. He should be able to lay his hand upon the book, and say, I believe in this. And he should see the peculiarities of Christianity not merely gasping for existence in single texts, but living, breathing, burning throughout; not merely standing alone and unconnected, like islands in a mighty ocean, but occupying and pervading the whole substance of the book from cover to cover. Then alone, provided he knows his Bible, can there be any good ground of hope that "with the heart he believeth" to salvation. And nothing short of this approaches either to the "full assurance of faith," or the "full assurance of understanding;" the *πληροφορία πίστεως* or the *πληροφορία της συνεισέως*.

We have now concluded all we have to offer in the way of objection to Mr. Wardlaw's books; and, with it, some observations which arose out of our remarks. The two works contain many useful criticisms, and illustrations of Scripture. On 1 John iii. 3, ("Every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself even as he is pure;") he makes the following just observation: "'In him,' (that is *in Christ*.) The expression is commonly interpreted as if it referred to the believer's having this hope *in himself*, that is, residing in his mind and heart. The phrase in the original, however, is *ἐν αὐτῷ*, which expresses not the exercise of hope in the heart of him who possesses it, but the ground on which his hope rests." (Discourses, p. 402.) This illustration is important to the English reader, and might escape the Scholar. On the whole, we regard Dr. Wardlaw's two works as a truly valuable accession to the theology of our language. There is a marked difference between his style and Mr. Yates's. As general characteristics we may mention, that the Trinitarian is warm and animated, the Unitarian cold and deliberate. The one has often a generous carelessness in his expressions that pleases us. The other measures his words, and maintains a specious air of studied simplicity. The one is eager because in earnest. He is struggling for his Bible and his hope of eternity. In fact, like the Unitarian contending for the externals of Christianity, he is fighting for life. With him the business is *de vitâ et sanguine*. The other is as much at his ease as if the whole business were a mere argument; and never loses himself but when he comes to personalities, or to inconvenient texts of Scripture. The one pleads like a party interested; the other like an advocate. And it is observable, as in the case of Paul and Tertullus, how, every now and then, the measured oratory

and guarded argumentation of the rhetorician droop and wither before the natural eloquence and strong sense of his vigorous antagonist.

We congratulate the city which possesses a Wardlaw and a Chalmers. And though we have felt it our duty to offer, with the deference that is due to their talents, some strictures upon both,—upon the one here, and upon the other in a preceding number,—we gladly hail these northern luminaries as brethren and fellow-helpers in the cause of truth. While we admire the keenness, the judgment, and the perseverance, with which the one pursues error, through all its windings, into its darkest and most profound retreats, and drags it out into daylight and detection, and the other pursues the grand object of Christian civilization,—we readily discover, in the piety, the ardour, and the devotedness of each, to what Master they belong.

Mr. Horne's book is of a different character from either of Mr. Wardlaw's, and is calculated to answer a different purpose. For the exposure of Unitarian inconsistency, Mr. Wardlaw's are the better adapted: but not, in our opinion, for a full statement of the true doctrine and its evidences. He has, in general, though not always, followed the plan of giving a few select texts, with a portion of argument attached to them. In some parts of his first volume, indeed, he presents us with masses of scriptural evidence. His object, however, in the main, has principally been a controversial work, and a defence of the truth. This object is answered. But for a full statement of the doctrine of the Trinity and of its evidences, we think, next to the Bible, those books are best which, with few pretensions and little argumentation, mainly consist, not of a small selection merely, but of a bulk of citations, judiciously chosen, and appropriately brought together. Therefore to those who wish to see some considerable portion of the evidences of the doctrine of the Trinity at one view, we would recommend such books as Mr. Horne's. Those authors, we think, are most likely to help the learner, who are not above writing a book containing much of Scripture and little of their own; though it might be useless to put such a book into the hands of a Unitarian, or even of a professed believer, were he of a contentious, contesting turn. The author of such a work should state his evidence in the rough, without standing to chaffer about particular criticisms—should give the truth in one broad stream of light, without splitting it into minute, and diverging, and counteracting rays. Some idea of what we mean may be gathered from Mr. Wardlaw's fifth sermon. But, to explain ourselves more fully, we would refer to the portion of Mr. Horne's work lying between p. 12

and p. 57 ; where, as the passage, in a great measure, consists of texts of Scripture well selected and arranged, we have in fact forty-five pages almost as full of truth as they can hold. Except when an author is writing for his direct opponents, we have no notion of his blunting the edge and breaking the force of his evidence, by pausing every now and then to argue away objections which he feels to be totally irrelevant. In contending against unbelievers, indeed, we must fight our way on, we must clear as we go. But it is exceedingly observable, that we ought by no means to think of checking ourselves by needless delays, or hampering ourselves by needless contention, when writing either for believers, or for those who are only ignorant, and not decidedly of the adverse party. We shall venture to say even of Mr. Wardlaw's books, that those portions of them which are the least controversial are the most calculated for general usefulness ; nay, that they prove the most : and also that those contain the greatest portion of important truth, where there are the least pains taken to detect error. And if he could find time to publish a volume or two of sermons, not written for the purpose, but such as he generally preaches to his people, and without controversy, we are much mistaken if they would not be very acceptable to the sound part of the public, and raise his high character in the religious world even higher than it has ever yet stood.

As we have already said, too, we are not for the plan of contracting our defences. In teaching the doctrines of truth, let us take a large ground. We have a right. It is all our own. Let us not heed the cavils of opponents. They are so many totally groundless claims to what is not theirs. To one whose mind is not adverse to the truth, every passage of Scripture which does in fact *reveal* a doctrine of Scripture, should be employed to reveal it. And, to a believer, every passage which, however obscurely, *contains* the doctrine, may be of service, and is calculated to be of service, and was intended to be of service, in confirming his faith in it. When, indeed, a mass of scriptural evidence is thus brought to bear upon a contested point, the unbeliever has his resource in saying it may be got over. But let it be considered what he is asserting, when he says this. If, by getting over, he means that it may be proved false, we of course deny this. But if he only means that it may be explained away, we answer, that even this is only to be done by a sustained effort of unbelief ;—by a sustained resistance to the plain sense of the Bible, displayed in a constant succession of criticisms, some of them very lame and miserable. And the very necessity for this mode of proceeding proves that the cause which has

recourse to it is a bad one. For that cannot be scriptural truth, which is only to be established by a sustained war against the language of Scripture.

To say the truth, we are unwilling that established evidences should be given up, even when much has been urged, and something has been conceded, to their disadvantage: as in the case of the text in the latter part of the first epistle of St. John. A zealous and hearty advocate of the truth will give up nothing till he is obliged. And if any have been the more ready to surrender particular passages, because too distinct and decided for their fastidious orthodoxy, we are sorry on their account. As to the various modes of stating the doctrine itself, we own we have sometimes liked the least cautious the best. There may, indeed, be a statement which runs too much into hazardous particularities. But we are always sorry to observe that species of caution which leaves a statement short of the truth. We felt, therefore, much gratification in a statement which we met with in a little tract, already mentioned, by Mr. White; and which, with a passage quoted by him from Horsley, we shall here give.

“Believing most fully the absolute unity of the Divine nature, I believe also that this unity is perfectly consistent with a personal distinction, and that there are three Divine Persons, (not distinct Beings, nor divided parts of the Godhead, but) three intelligent Agents, who have condescended to perform distinct offices, and to enter into different relations to mankind. These Divine Persons I worship under the titles of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.” (P. 34.)

Bishop Horsley’s words are—

“I maintain that the three Persons are one Being; one by mutual relation, indissoluble connection, and gradual subordination; so strictly one, that any individual thing, in the whole world of matter and of spirit, presents but a faint shadow of their unity. I maintain that each person by himself is God; because each possesses fully every attribute of the Divine nature. But I maintain that these three Persons are all included in the very idea of a God; and that for that reason, as well as for the identity of the attributes in each, it were impious and absurd to say there are three Gods. For to say there are three Gods, were to say, there are three Fathers, three Sons, and three Holy Ghosts. I maintain the equality of the three Persons, in all the attributes of the Divine nature. I maintain their equality in rank and authority, with respect to all created things, whatever relations or differences may subsist between themselves. Differences there must be, lest we confound the Persons; which was the error of Sabellius. But the differences can only consist in the personal properties, lest we divide the substance, and make a plurality of independent Gods.” (P. 35, note.)

We think both these are statements of men who are at home in the subject, and know their ground. And if any objection

is made to the plurality of persons in the Divine Unity which is here so explicitly dwelt upon, our best answer will be in the words of Gousset which we gave before; and part of which we shall now repeat in English. "You will say, This plurality is inconsistent with the nature of God. I ask, in return, How do you know that? The declaration of God, *who knows*, is worth more than your reasoning, *who do not know*." (See Reply, p. 88.)

The necessity for maintaining the distinction of the Persons is well shown in a passage quoted by Mr. Horne from the Bishop, his namesake. This amiable prelate, it is well known, bore the title of Hutchinsonian. But we see nothing in the following extract which goes beyond sound Trinitarianism.

"Say no more, then, that the doctrine of the Trinity is a matter of curiosity and amusement only. Our religion is founded upon it. For what is Christianity but a manifestation of the three divine Persons, as engaged in the great work of man's redemption, begun, continued, and to be ended by them, in their several relations of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier, three Persons, one God? If there be no Son of God, where is our redemption? If there be no Holy Spirit, where is our sanctification? Without both, where is our salvation?" (P. 79.)

What we say of the Trinity, we say indeed of all the doctrines of our redemption:—that we ought not to shrink from stating them in all their strangeness and unaccommodating simplicity. Not one prominent, not one even apparently incongruous feature, should be pared down.—No, nor in the slightest degree touched or smoothed off. Every thing should be presented to the view exactly as it is; and left to stand, open and unsheltered, in all the rough, unhewn simplicity of native truth. Any mode of statement that comes short of this, in fact, is cowardice. With all possible tenderness for the infirmities of believers, and therefore with all possible caution against making unnecessary difficulties, we must not care for the hostility or ridicule of infidels one jot. All true doctrine, fully and fairly stated, admits, from its very nature, of being placed, by "men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth," in a strange and ridiculous point of view. And a statement not admitting of this, is not a true, or if it be a true, is not a full statement. We have but one path, narrow indeed, but straight forward. And that path we must follow, in spite of every disturbing force, whether it would turn us to the right hand or to the left.

For the reasons we have given, we approve also of the following plain and distinct statement of Christian doctrine by a gentleman already quoted.

“ The system is exalting and consolatory to *man*. The three Divine Persons who had concurred in his creation, concurred in his redemption also. The Father gave the Son to redeem him; the Son freely and willingly engaged in the gracious work; the Holy Spirit undertook the renovation of his nature, and the restoration of the Divine image to his soul. By the incarnation of the Son of God, man is brought into the most intimate union with the Deity; by his ascension into heaven, the human is exalted far above the angelic nature, since in it Christ has taken possession of his throne of glory.” (White’s Address, p. 33.)

We are as anxious for distinct views of Christian doctrine in general, as for distinct views of the Persons of the Trinity. And we apprehend that an hostility both to one and the other lies at the bottom of Socinianism. Indeed the great error of modern theology seems to be, a dread of full and distinct statements of Christian doctrines, arising from an apprehension that if fully stated they will appear inconsistent with each other. Thus we must be cautious of too distinctly stating the doctrine of justification by faith alone, lest it should appear to preclude the necessity of sanctification: and in the same way, we must be cautious of too distinctly stating the doctrine of the Trinity, lest it should appear to preclude the doctrine of the Divine Unity. It is dreadful, when doctrines beautifully harmonizing, are thus set up in opposition to one another.

The fact is, that the ridicule, the offence, the dislike, called forth, often arise from a mistaken notion that what is only meant as a statement is intended for an explanation. We cannot agree with those who look upon the Athanasian creed as intended for an explanation of the doctrine of the Trinity. Here we do not materially differ from Mr. Horne, though in his analysis, towards the end of his volume, he seems to regard one part of the creed as illustrative of the other. He means illustrative of statements. We mean explanatory of doctrine. A creed, properly speaking, is a statement of doctrine; not an explanation. If we look to it for an explanation we may be totally disappointed; since the matter which it states may be inexplicable.—It is the office of an explanation to remove difficulties. It is the office of a statement to give them as they are. As it may be said of Christian obedience that it does not consist in obeying where there is no difficulty, but in obeying where there is a difficulty: so it may be said of Christian faith; that it does not consist in believing where there is no difficulty, but in believing where there is a difficulty. Therefore “ the carnal mind ” is hostile both to Christian obedience and to Christian faith. It endeavours to dispose of obedience by explaining away the commandments of God; and it endeavours to

dispose of faith, by explaining his mysteries. For an attempt to explain them, is generally an attempt to explain them away:—to get rid of a difficulty which it is intended that we should take as we find it. Therefore in the creeds which set forth the doctrines of the Bible and the church, we are not to look for an explanation of those doctrines. They are to be accepted, upon scriptural authority, on being stated, and, before they are explained. This is the trial of our faith. If afterwards we find that they admit of explanation, well. But for this, we maintain, we are not to stipulate, prior to acceptance: because, if we are, there is an end of faith.

There are many things in the gospel, which are mysteries, and which are intended to be mysteries. Now any statement of these mysteries, which came to us professing to be an explanation, would come to us with falsehood written upon its front. We need not give ourselves the trouble of examining it. The time may be better employed which we should employ in attending to it. It cannot be true, for it professes to make that plain which is not plain. State the doctrine, if you please. But state it so, that not one real difficulty shall be slurred over or mitigated. God is pleased by these difficulties to try your faith in him. Attempt to remove them, and what does it prove? It proves only this:—that you flinch from this trial of your faith.—In the Athanasian creed, we have a full, fearless, and minute statement of certain high and important mysteries; with every difficulty at full length, and undisguised:—but no explanation.—Unless indeed by an explanation we understand a more particular statement and illustration. But we mean, nothing that takes from the difficulty: nothing that represents the sacred doctrine otherwise than it is:—high and deep beyond our limited comprehensions.

Of the necessity of clear and decided views of the distinction of Persons in the Trinity, we are becoming more convinced every day of our lives. It is the office of faith, we imagine, first to have as clear and decided views of the Trinity as if the Unity had never been heard of; secondly, to have as clear and decided a view of the Unity, as if the Trinity had never been heard of; and then, thirdly, to believe faithfully that neither of these views is inconsistent with the other, but, on the contrary, that both are true. *Our* creed is, that there is a Trinity so decidedly marked, that if we knew of it alone, we must have believed in three Persons without any unity of substance; that there is a unity so decidedly marked, that if we knew of it alone, we must have believed in one substance without any division of Persons; and that this Trinity and this Unity centre in the Godhead. This is the doctrine of the Athanasian creed. This

is the doctrine of our church. This is the doctrine of the Bible. From the caution of some we might almost apprehend that they had no distinct view either of the Trinity or of the Unity,—but only an obscure idea of something between both. Thus when we are told that our distance to a place to which we are going is only three or four miles, unless we are in the habit of thinking very closely, we shall not present to ourselves the two ideas of three miles and four miles, but only one idea between the two—say of three miles and a half. And, for ordinary matters, this is the plan which will best answer our purpose. But we must beware of so loose a mode of thinking when we come to the contemplation of heavenly things, and to the language of the Holy Ghost.

That we may not be misunderstood in any thing we have now offered, we will here state that we regard the doctrine of the strict unity of the Godhead as an essential, as a vital, as an indispensable doctrine of the Christian religion. We consider this unity as a spiritual, actual, indissoluble, essential, unity. By spiritual, we mean unity of Spirit in that which is Spirit. By actual, we mean a real and not a figurative unity. By indissoluble, we mean not merely a unity that can never be dissolved, but a unity that has always been what it is. By essential, we mean a unity of essence. The three Divine Persons are eternally, necessarily, intensely One:—so that nothing created can give even an idea of their unity:—so that the union of the two sides of the same human body, making one frame, comes totally short of it:—so that the union of any two things in nature which are called the same,—the union of soul and body, nay the union of natural identity, falls short of conveying even a shadow of an idea of the inconceivable unity of the Godhead. Yet at the same time do we maintain that the catholic faith consists, not merely in believing that God is one, but in believing in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and that these three are one.

With regard to those who call themselves Unitarians, as we have already intimated, we question whether they are entitled to the name. As Tertullian says: “*Duos et tres (deos) jam jactitant a nobis prædicari; se vero unius Dei cultores præsumunt: quasi non et UNITAS, IRRATIONALITER COLLECTA, HÆRESIM FACIAT; et Trinitas, rationaliter expensa, veritatem constituat.*” (See *Elements of Christian Theology*, vol. ii. p. 95.) We cannot bring ourselves to believe that Unitarians have any thing approaching, or even tending, or even pointing to a sound belief in the doctrine of the Divine Unity. Their notion appears to be, that this doctrine and that of the Trinity cannot stand together. Therefore it seems to us, that, on their principles,

if once they were fairly brought to confess the Trinity, they would feel themselves constrained to deny the Unity. Hypolytus, an early father, as cited by Mr. Horne, confirms us in this view of ours.

"We can no otherwise" he observes, "consider God as one, but as believing truly in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The Word of the Father, knowing the administration (or economy of the Three Persons) and that it was the will of the Father to be thus honoured, and not otherwise, gave his disciples orders, after his resurrection, to this purpose; *Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*; signifying, that whosoever should leave out any one of the three, should come so far short of knowing God perfectly, for by this Trinity the Father is glorified." (See p. 133.)

In this we certainly agree. There is no real Unitarianism, except in the real faith, as it was once delivered to the saints: that sound, scriptural, spiritual Unitarianism, which worships the Trinity in Unity and the Unity in Trinity.—We question, therefore, the claim of Unitarians to the title which they bear; and maintain that, after all, with all their self-ascription of profound and peculiarly appropriate views upon the subject, they have come totally short of the glory of God—have never had even a view of that strict and proper Unity, of which they talk so much—but that they believe only in a nonentity—a phantasm—an airy nothing—the creation of their own minds. We maintain that even at the very best they believe only a portion of that truth, which, in order to be believed aright, must be believed entire. They ought to have some name that would show this: something which would show that they do not believe in the Divine Unity, but in something short of Unity. "Partialists," or "Fractionalists," was the name that struck us. But it might be thought that we wished to raise a smile upon a very serious subject; and therefore we leave them for the present in possession of the title of Unitarians, which, if we come to right, belongs only, appropriately, to the members of the general church, who are the only real believers in the strict and proper Unity of the Deity:—the ONLY REAL BELIEVERS, we are not afraid to say again; for "whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, HATH NOT GOD. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, HE HATH BOTH THE FATHER AND THE SON." (2 John 9.)

If we preach our God and Saviour Jesus Christ to the Unitarian, he will charge us, like the Athenians in the Acts of the Apostles, with setting forth a "strange God." Talk of the Supreme Being, and he will not object. But talk of the Supreme Being as coming into the world, and he will deny

him. Therefore, if we must not strictly charge him with atheism, we may charge him with something very much like it. The Greek for Atheist is *ἄθεος*, the Greek for Socinian is *ἄθεος ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ*. The one is "without God." The other is "without God in the world."

We have dwelt, however, in some of the preceding remarks, upon the necessity of observing the distinction of persons in the Godhead, because we think the evils of Sabellianism are as great as those of Unitarianism. Indeed the two systems are not very remote from each other; and there are people, if we mistake not, who call themselves "Sabellian Unitarians." The systems are also allied in their origin. In both cases we have *error*, arising from a desire to get rid of *mystery*. In both cases, the speculator endeavours to bring that within the grasp of reason which is beyond its grasp, and dies in his reasonings.

We would here urge, also, the immense importance to the Christian scheme, of clear and decided views of the humanity of the Redeemer, as well as of the Unity of the Godhead. It is essentially necessary, that, according to the words of the Athanasian creed, "we believe rightly the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ." It is as necessary to have a full sense of the humanity of the Word of God, as of the Divinity of Jesus of Nazareth. We must not only assert that the Son of Man was God, but that "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." And here also the Unitarians fall short of the true faith. They have no truer belief of the humanity of Christ, than they have of the Unity of the Godhead. They merely believe in the humanity of a man. The true faith is, that we believe in the humanity of God the Redeemer, of him besides whom there is no Saviour. Dr. Chalmers has well expressed the nature of this faith in one of his sermons.

"If nature and her elements be dreadful, how dreadful that mysterious and unseen Being, who sits behind the elements he has formed, and gives birth and movement to all things! It is the mystery in which he is shrouded,—it is that dark and unknown region of spirits, where he reigns in glory, and stands revealed to the immediate view of his worshippers,—it is the inexplicable manner of his being so far removed from that province of sense, within which the understanding of man can expatiate,—it is its total unlikeness to all that nature can furnish to the eye of the body, or to the conception of the mind which animates it,—it is all this which throws the Being who formed us at a distance so inaccessible, which throws an impenetrable mantle over his way, and gives us the idea of some dark and untrodden interval betwixt the glory of God, and all that is visible and created."

"Now Jesus Christ has lifted up this mysterious veil, or rather he has entered within it. He is now at the right hand of God; and though the brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of

his person, he appeared to us in the palpable character of a man; and those high attributes of truth, and justice, and mercy, which could not be felt or understood, as they existed in the abstract and invisible Deity, are brought down to our conceptions in a manner the most familiar and impressive, by having been made, through Jesus Christ, to flow in utterance from human lips, and to beam in expressive physiognomy from a human countenance."

"So long as I had nothing before me but the unseen Spirit of God, my mind wandered in uncertainty, my busy fancy was free to expatiate, and its images filled my heart with disquietude and terror. But in the life, and person, and history of Jesus Christ, the attributes of the Deity are brought down to the observation of the senses; and I can no longer mistake them, when in the Son, who is the express image of his Father, I see them carried home to my understanding by the evidence and expression of human organs,—when I see the kindness of the Father, in the tears which fell from his Son at the tomb of Lazarus,—when I see his justice blended with his mercy, in the exclamation, 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem,' by Jesus Christ; uttered with a tone more tender than the sympathy of human bosom ever prompted, while he bewailed the sentence of its desolation,—and in the look of energy and significance which he threw upon Peter, I feel the judgment of God himself flashing conviction upon my conscience, and calling me to repent while his wrath is suspended, and he still waiteth to be gracious."

"And it was not a temporary character which he assumed. . . . We have a Priest on high, who is touched with a fellow-feeling of our infirmities. My soul, unable to support itself in its aerial flight among the spirits of the invisible, now reposes on Christ, who stands revealed to my conceptions, in the figure, the countenance, the heart, the sympathies of a man. He has entered within that veil which hung over the glories of the Eternal,—and the mysterious, inaccessible throne of God is divested of all its terrors, when I think that a friend who bears the form of the species, and knows its infirmities, is there to plead for me." (Sermons, 1812, p. 186.)

In a word, whether our attention be directed to the Father, the Saviour, or the Comforter; whether to the Man Jesus Christ, to the Shepherd and Redeemer of Israel, the High Priest of our profession, the King of Saints, the Prophet, the Lawgiver, the Mediator between God and man, or the equal of Jehovah; we should have a full, distinct, and believing view of divine truth in all these aspects. As the divine life comes to be more vigorous within us, all these views will be more distinct. As it droops and flags, they will be more partial, ill-defined, and obscure. One view will by no means interfere with the other. Suppose a man standing at noon in a chamber with many windows towards the south. He goes to one of them, and there he sees the sun shining right opposite to him in full splendour. But can he only see it at that window? Far from it. He goes to another, and

there he sees the same object right opposite to him still. And so it will be if he goes to all. Yet there are not many suns, but one sun.

On the contrary, when a person shuts up all his ideas of the Godhead in one sweeping and exclusive idea of Unity, and thus gets rid of all those particularities of Christian doctrine which can only be real, if the doctrine of the Trinity be real, the man who says his prayers before a crucifix is nearer to the kingdom of heaven than he. Refusing to look beyond his own unscriptural conceptions, and taking that for Christianity which is only metaphysical speculation of a very ordinary kind, he makes a return from the Christian to the Jewish dispensation, from a Deity more clearly, to a Deity more obscurely revealed. He is brought back, in fact, to the religion of the saints who lived before the Christian dispensation, which might do very well for them, but is not the religion intended for us. We would explain ourselves. We speak not of the religion of those who lived before the birth of Christ, as in its *nature* different from the religion of the present day. Religion in its nature has always been the same; namely, salvation by grace through faith. But there is a difference of *modification* in Christian faith and the faith of believers under the Mosaic dispensation. They lived before our Lord's crucifixion, death, and resurrection. We live after them. They looked forward to promises, of which we look back upon the performance. When our Lord bowed his head upon the cross, and said, "It is finished," the thing was done. To them there was an indistinct, to us there is a comparatively distinct revelation. On us the Sun of Righteousness is risen. To them he was yet below the spiritual horizon. A return, therefore, from our faith to theirs is a return from open day to twilight.

One difficulty indeed may be started, when we recommend so many distinct views of the scheme of salvation, as belonging to the Christian faith: namely, "How are they to be all reconciled, as uniting in one system of Divine truth?" But this difficulty we may safely leave to that Being who has eternal wisdom to go to work with; and who, occupying and controlling the whole range of natural and spiritual existence, has ample space to adjust and to bring together whatever appears incongruous or opposed to our limited capacities. It is our business to believe; it is God's to reconcile. The hesitation of ignorance may admit, in some cases, of excuse. The hesitation of unbelief is a destroying sin. "It is certain," says Milner, "that these essentials cannot be neglected or despised, without a turpitude of heart, which the Scripture connects with the final ruin of the soul." (Church History, vol. ii. chap. xvii.) If, in parti-

cular, in referring to any of these distinctions in our minds, whether of persons, of functions, or of doctrines, we will not see them in their real importance, then will our ideas of all those essentials of Christianity fade away, which are only real if these distinctions are real. The mediation and intercession of the Saviour, the atonement, the purchase, the redemption, the reconciliation, all will come to nothing. First our views of these things will become obscure and undefined. Then, as we attempt to fix them, they will become meagre and curtailed. Then we shall begin to say that they are mere *figures*. Then, in the elusive form which we have thus given them, they will soon become mere *nothings*, and vanish from our grasp. Then we shall doubt them altogether. Then we shall deny them.—And then,—we shall not be far from total apostasy.

One great safeguard, under the Divine protection, will be a full persuasion of the plenary inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. We venture to say, that in the existing nature of things, a book intended to convey to us a revelation must come to us as plenary inspired, or it must come to us in vain. We say that as long as there is not a full acceptance of a book containing a revelation,—as long as there is not an implicit admission of the Divine authority of every part of it,—while things continue as they are, it never can convey that revelation. For we shall only accept just what we happen to like; and, as to what we do not like, this, we shall say, is the part which is not authentic. Therefore we shall just be brought to believe, with the book, what we might be brought to believe without it. Not one point will be gained with us. Not one article of faith will be planted in our minds, but what might equally be planted there, without all this apparatus of sending a book to make it known. The short measure of our intellect, the uncertain measure of our fancy, or the false measure of our inclination, will be the measure of our faith. To the extent of this measure we may believe, but no further. To the extent of a capacity so limited or modified, we may be filled, but no further. All that is communicated beyond this must run out as fast as it is poured in. We shall admit of being filled up to a certain point, but beyond this we can receive nothing.

On the contrary, there will be every advantage in a belief in the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. Not merely shall we have an advantage over the sceptic, in believing many passages as they stand which he denies or perverts, but even those which he agrees to receive with us, will come on our minds with a tenfold greater force than on his. In his heart a thousand fences are set up against the authority even of a passage of admitted genuineness, which against the force and weight of

plenary inspiration could never stand an instant. When we believe in this plenary inspiration, every expression has its import, every word its value. There is a readiness to accept the sense, which marvellously facilitates the finding of the sense.

Under the same circumstances, also, there will be a readiness to take things in their literal or their obvious meaning. A passage may be taken in three ways:—either as signifying exactly what it expresses, or more than it expresses, or less than it expresses. Now we venture to offer the following canon for the interpretation of Holy Writ:—namely, that every passage of Scripture must be taken in the first or second of these ways, none in the third: that is, that every passage either signifies exactly what it expresses, or more than it expresses;—never less than it expresses. When the canon first occurred to us, as a rule to assist our private studies, we apprehended that it required some modification. But after consideration and use, we are inclined to leave it to be qualified by the judgment of our readers, aware that it admits of being misrepresented and misunderstood, but persuaded that those who will give it a fair trial in a candid spirit will find it serviceable. Some passages will of course be considered as exceptions to the rule. But even here we would recommend a little discrimination before it is rejected.

And while almost every passage has one or the other of these two senses, that is, means either precisely what it expresses, or else, more than it expresses, we are of opinion that a far greater number are of the former description than some persons would suppose. On this subject, we shall quote a passage from Horsley's letters to Dr. Priestley:—for, in these discussions, we are not wandering from the Unitarian controversy.

“You think the phrase in question ‘is similar to other Jewish phrases,’ which you think will be allowed to be merely expressive of humanity. I fear, Sir, it hath been the custom of late to lay too much stress upon Jewish idioms, in the exposition of the didactic parts of the New Testament. The gospel is a general revelation.* If it is delivered in a style, which is not perspicuous to the illiterate of any nation except the Jewish, it is as much locked up from general apprehension, as if the sacred books had been written in the vernacular gibberish of the Jews of that age. The Holy Spirit, which directed the apostles and the evangelists to the use of the tongue, which in their day was the most generally understood—the Greek, would for the same reason, it may be presumed, suggest to them a style which might be generally perspicuous. It is therefore a principle with me, that the true sense of any phrase in the New Testament is, for the most part,

* “The religion of Christ was an universal religion, and the doctrines of the gospel were calculated for the western as well as the eastern hemisphere.” See Mr. Shepherd's preface to his *Free Examination*, &c.”

what may be called a standing sense: that which will be the first to occur to common people of every country, and in every age: and I am apt to think that the difference between this standing sense and the Jewish sense will, in all cases, be far less than is imagined, or none at all; because, though different languages differ widely in their refined and elevated idioms, common speech is in all languages pretty much the same." (Horsley's fourth letter to Dr. Priestley, sec. 3.)

It will be observed how hostile this passage is, (as well as the canon of ours, proposed above,) to that mode of disposing of difficult passages of Scripture which consists in pronouncing them merely figurative. We have no objection to calling many passages figurative. But "*merely figurative*"—that is the phrase of which we disapprove. It sounds as if the thing signified by the figure, were something less, or meaner, or less real, than the figure itself. Here our views and Mr. Wardlaw's totally coincide.

"When we speak of the *sacrificial language*, (if I may so express myself) of the New Testament, in reference to the death of Christ, it is usual to resolve it all into *figure* and *allusion*. This, however, is at once to deprive the language of its meaning, and the rites alluded to of theirs. It is, besides, to charge the writers with singular folly. No idea could well be simpler, or more easily expressed, than that of a prophet's dying to confirm his testimony, or rather to prove his sincerity in delivering it, (for his submitting to sufferings and death could prove no more than this,) or even to afford in his own rising from the grave, the evidence and the pledge of a future resurrection. Why such language as that which has been quoted, should be so constantly used to express such ideas as these, if these were indeed the ideas intended to be conveyed, is a question which can hardly be answered, on any principle consistent with the inspiration, or even with the common sense of the writers. If the death of Christ was not an atonement for sin,—the law and the prophets, Jesus himself, his forerunner, and his apostles, all spoke a language which is to me utterly unintelligible; and which could not have more effectually deceived, had it been framed for the express purpose of deception." (Discourses, p. 204.)

This way of speaking, surely, is far better than theirs, who say, for instance, "Our Lord died *merely* to magnify the law and to make it honourable—*merely* to convince us of God's wrath against sin:" though these ends were no doubt answered and included. The fact we believe to be this: that the Bible contains spiritual truth conveyed in the language best calculated to convey it. We must not attempt then to mend this conveyance by substituting other languages. Every such substitution will only put us one step farther from the truth. For instance: whenever a writer says that a passage of Scripture is merely figurative, it is usual for him to give, in lieu of it, some other explanation of the meaning intended to be conveyed. Now

what we contend for is this :—that the explanation thus given is not so near the truth as the figure which it supersedes ; but that, on the contrary, it is one degree farther off. The figure, very possibly, comes short of the thing signified. But the explanation comes short of the figure. It is dreadful when men thus take the gospel of God into their own hands, and modify and mitigate it according to their fancies. And the great misfortune is, that this way of getting over passages by saying they are *merely* figurative, most unhappily occupies itself, as if by preference, upon those very passages which contain doctrines essential to our salvation ; doctrines, through the simple acceptance of which, our souls are to be delivered from perishing everlastingly. It strikes therefore at the root of all saving faith, and introduces obscure, mistrustful, unsatisfying views, upon those very points with respect to which our belief ought to be most clear, most fearless, most assured, most full, most solid, most positive.

We have a few more miscellaneous remarks to offer, and shall then conclude. Apprehensions have been expressed of a great increase of Unitarianism. They are not felt by us. Dr. Wardlaw's apprehensions for his own country seem equally slight. Respecting a very *imposing* catalogue of delegates, who were present at a meeting held at Edinburgh in May, 1815, he makes the following observations.

“ This is, no doubt, a somewhat formidable list ; and when a person reads of *delegates*, and *congregations*, and *very encouraging accounts*, he is apt to be not a little startled One of the towns mentioned as having a *delegate* present, was left, I have been informed, empty of its Unitarianism, when the said delegate took his departure to attend the meeting. Invited for this purpose to Edinburgh, he complied with the invitation, and appeared there as the representative of—*himself* !—and gave withal, it may be presumed, a ‘ very encouraging account ’ of the progress of Unitarianism in the place where he had *got* and *given* his commission of delegation. In another of these towns, there has been discovered a solitary old woman professing Unitarian principles, who is not acquainted with any ‘ of that way ’ in the place, besides herself. In more places than one, although they have made several attempts to gain a footing, their success has been so very small, that inquirers after them have hardly been able to discover their existence ; from which, (as it is not, in general, their nature, to ‘ blush unseen, ’) we may, I presume, infer, that in such places they are not at least in sufficient numbers to keep one another in countenance. In several of these stations I have heard of three, in one of five or six, in another of from eight to twelve, in another of seventeen, in another of twenty ; the largest number of which I have heard in any place is between twenty and thirty, and even this only in one instance ; and some of the persons included in the number, hardly avowed Unitarians, but only

'tanquam suspecti.' The inquiries which have produced such results, have been made at the *most considerable* of the places enumerated, which it is, perhaps, more than justice to take as a standard for the rest. Double, if you please, the amount in every one of them; and still, surely, there must be some little quackery, in puffing them off as 'very encouraging accounts.' " (Reply, p. 389.)

The real grounds for apprehending an extension of Unitarian principles will be found in the following passage.

"One of the great leading tendencies of the Unitarian system is the *exaltation of man*. It flatters the conscious dignity of his nature, by treating as 'an old-wives'-fable' the doctrine of original depravity. It flatters his pride of intellect, by making Reason the arbitress of the dictates of Revelation. It flatters his pride of self-righteousness, by assuring him, that his own virtue is to procure his acceptance with God. By denying the deity and atonement of Christ, it releases the mind from the overwhelming impression of the infinite malignity of sin. By exhibiting 'a God all mercy,' softening down the 'terrors of the Lord,' and proclaiming an assurance, that none shall finally perish, but that all shall ultimately arrive at the enjoyment of everlasting happiness, it alleviates the sinner's apprehension of danger, makes him feel more at his ease with God, as a Being whose countenance, instead of the frown of an offended Judge, wears towards all his creatures the smiles of paternal love, and who will not be severe to mark or to punish the frailties of his erring children. By denying the existence and influences of the Holy Spirit, it offers incense to the self-sufficiency of man, and to the omnipotence of human resolutions and human efforts, in working out a self-procured salvation." (Reply, p. 391.)

Dr. Wardlaw then asks: "If these things be so;—if Unitarianism be thus consonant with so many of the principles of corrupt nature, how comes it to pass that it does not meet with a more general reception? That its converts are comparatively few;—that, with not many exceptions, its preachers proclaim their doctrines to empty pews and echoing walls;—are matters of unquestionable notoriety." The Doctor gives a satisfactory answer to this inquiry, showing two of the principal reasons to be, the palpable falsehood of the pretension of Unitarianism to be the doctrine of the Bible, and the circumstance that there are wants in the condition of mankind, which Unitarianism does not meet. In the midst of the general attention which is now beginning to be paid to religious subjects,—there is one circumstance, indeed, which we think will always prevent the Unitarians obtaining any thing like a share of those who are leaving the ranks of the *Nothingarians*—the heathen population of countries called Christian:—namely, that those who are anxious to embrace Christianity, will prefer something that possesses a few of the peculiar marks and tokens of Christianity. A prudent housewife, when she has at length determined upon purchasing

able of domestic economy, generally makes up her mind not to grudge a little extra expense, but to have the article good of its kind. Thus will it be, we think, with those persons in the present day who take up a profession of religion. They will wish to have a good article. And therefore they will not become Unitarians.

“ But it is, above all, to the providence and the grace of God that we must look, for the prevention of the progress of error. The Unitarians are very boastful of their ‘ day of small things ’ in Scotland. Long may it continue such !—long, I trust, it shall continue such. It is not of *their* doctrine that God hath said, ‘ It shall accomplish that which I please, and prosper in the thing whereto I send it.’ It is not to *their* ‘ planting,’ or to *their* ‘ watering,’ that he has promised to ‘ give an increase.’ They have sown their ‘ handful,’ not of ‘ corn,’ but of tares; and they are looking for a plentiful crop. But ‘ the Lord of the Harvest,’ we trust, will disappoint their expectations. Their seed wants the showers of Divine blessing; and never, either on the mountains, or in the valleys of Caledonia, shall it ‘ shake with prosperous fruit.’ It shall be ‘ as the grass on the house-tops, which withereth before it groweth up; wherewith the mower filleth not his hand, nor he that bindeth sheaves, his bosom.’ ” (Reply, p. 396.)

Meanwhile let the believers profit by all the instruction which the case of the Unitarian is calculated to afford. Above all, let him not be high-minded, but fear. “ Because of unbelief they are broken off, and thou standest by faith.”—“ Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall.” Into not one error have they fallen, into which every man living, through the natural blindness and obstinacy of his heart, is not liable to fall. He who is preserved from falling, after their example, owes it not to any wisdom of his own, but to the grace of God :—who is as able to restore them, as he is to keep his followers safe.—Let the Christian beware, especially, of an irreverent, contesting, criticising, intrusive spirit, when he is entering on the contemplation of sacred things. This will be continually drawing aside his attention from what is plain to what is obscure in religion—that is, from what is more important to what is less so.—For that which is most plain, most intelligible, we had almost said most superficial in religion, is that which it most intimately concerns us to know. An arrogant spirit of criticism, also, will blunt the effect of the plain truths of religion, and of plain passages of Scripture, even when we give them our attention. For, taking them up argumentatively and contentiously, instead of simply and teachably, we shall subject them, to speak chemically, to a rude analysis, in the course of which the fine ethereal spirit which they contain, and which it ought to be our business to extract

and secure, will escape and be lost.—There is a farther danger in theological criticism, at the same time, as Barrett has observed, of acquiring habits of speaking, (and of thinking, too, we may add,) with irreverent familiarity of the Supreme Being. There is a danger, also, of placing too great a dependance on our own knowledge and discernment; and too little on Divine power and wisdom. “Ye do err,” said our Lord, “not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God.” Now the critic often knows the Scriptures, but not the power of God. Nothing, as Paley says, is more dangerous than common literary trifling about the Scriptures. But at the same time it must not be forgotten, that nothing is more profitable, nothing more favourable to our spiritual growth, than a very minute and close study of the sacred text, provided it be accompanied with humility, with prayer, and, above all, with faith in God.

We are so strongly impressed with the danger of a disputative spirit in matters of religion, that we wish to offer one or two additional remarks upon the subject. We believe that Socinians have it, but not Socinians alone. We speak of that spirit which takes up every subject, connected with religion, contentiously. We see it in their publications, which are chiefly controversial:—and indeed, in controversy, it will be said, how can contention be avoided? But we must remind our readers that we see it, also, in their discourses. We have lately read several. And we may safely say, strip them of their controversial matter, take away what is levelled at the general church, strike out political discussion, and political allusions, and in some cases nothing will remain; in others next to nothing, or worse than nothing. The system of their pulpit-oratory is altogether a system of attack and defence. Deprive them of this, and the whole theology of Unitarianism would not afford matter for fifty-two sermons to fill up the year. Fatal is it for teachers, when such alone is the food which they delight to lay before their people. Fatal is it for a congregation, when such alone is the food by which they are to be attracted and held together.

In the midst of the clamour and contention of contending sects, some within the general church, and some without, we have happily one rule of discernment. The tree shall be known by its fruits. By this test Unitarianism must fall.

“Where, we again ask, is any thing resembling the ‘wonderful changes’ which it is so confidently alleged to have effected ‘in the beginning of the gospel?’ Are its weapons now, as of old, ‘mighty through God, to the pulling down of strong-holds, casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obe-

It has as yet, indeed, only been tried at home—~~in this country~~ tries. Let it, then, be tried abroad. Carry it far hence unto the heathen.” (Dr. Wardlaw, it seems, when he wrote this, had not heard of the ‘very encouraging accounts’ from the coast of Malabar.) “Let active zeal send forth its missionaries to the regions of darkness and of the shadow of death. I will not ask for instantaneous and extensive revolutions in the views and characters of men;” (we feel inclined to whisper—ask for one missionary and five hundred pounds:)—“for altars overturned, temples deserted, and bonfires of magical books. These, I should be told, distinguished the days of miraculous evidence. But I will ask, first of all, for the manifestation of apostolic benevolence,” (five hundred pounds,) “and apostolic zeal,” (one missionary,) “amongst those who arrogate to themselves the exclusive possession of apostolic principles,—of the gospel in its original purity and simplicity. Paul’s ‘spirit was stirred in him, when he saw the city (Athens) wholly given to idolatry.’ Let us see some stirrings of this deep concern for the glory of a dishonoured Deity, and of this melting compassion for the souls of deluded and perishing men. Can those principles be the same with Paul’s, which allow the professors of them to sit still in listless apathy, while they view a world given to idolatry?—making no attempts themselves to turn men from idols to the living God, and deriding, as visionary enthusiasm, the missionary efforts of others? It is useless to ask for the *effects* of such attempts, while the attempts themselves have not been made.” (Reply, p. 403.)

Real devotion will alone settle our views, and bring us to the knowledge of the truth. “If any man will do the will of God, *he* shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God.” A submission of the will, then, to the will of God is the thing that is wanted. The way in which we are required to walk may appear difficult. But the reason is, because we have not obediently entered upon it. The wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein.” That is, they who actually set out on the journey, though simple persons, shall find that difficulties clear away as they go on. Were we all really intent in our hearts upon seeking the will of God, and being conformed to it, and did we all really “take delight in approaching to him,” we should soon find that, as to matters of higher importance, we had begun to be of one mind; and, as to matters of inferior importance, they could not make us fall out, even though we differed upon them. So also, on the other hand, the want of any real desire to draw nigh to God through the Saviour, to find his will and to do it, is the cause of heresies and schisms. We will not come unto the light that we may have light. “This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, nei-

ther cometh to the light, lest his deeds should
 But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his
 be made manifest that they are wrought in God.

Another conclusion in which we have been confirmed in our attention to the Socinian controversy, is this :—that there is no medium between a full acceptance of the truths of the gospel, on the one hand, and downright infidelity, by which we mean downright Atheism, on the other. Wherever we are between these two extreme points, whether Arians, Pelagians, Socinians, Deists, or Freethinkers, to one or the other we are most certainly tending. There may be spots in this wide and desert interval where we may continue awhile ; but there is no place of fixed abode, no place where we can settle. Either we shall go on from faith to faith, daily growing and advancing in the knowledge and the love of God, or else we shall go on from declivity to declivity, constantly abandoning one point of Scripture after another in our hearts, and gradually tending to the land of darkness and of the shadow of death. We find society, accordingly, in the present day, gradually drawing off in two opposite directions, and forming into two grand and adverse groups, to one of which each of us, who has not yet made his decision, is unquestionably approaching. The distinction is constantly becoming not only more and more perceptible, but more and more real—less a distinction in terms and in party-names, more a distinction in essentials—less a mere distinction between high church and low church, orthodox and evangelical, conformist and non-conformist—more a distinction between religious and irreligious, between the godly and the enemies of godliness, between the wheat and the tares, between those who know God and those who know him not, between those who labour for the extension of the gospel and those who oppose it, between those who trust in a Saviour and those who trust in themselves, between those who believe what God says in the Bible and those who believe it not, between those who prize the essential truths of Christianity and those who revile them, between those who love the Lord Je-sus Christ in sincerity, and those who would crucify him afresh if he were to appear among them and they were able. Such is the grand division which is now beginning to show itself in society. Any attempt to remain neutral is an attempt which rapidly consigns us to the worse alliance, indeed proves that in reality we already belong to it.

Under these circumstances, we insist on the necessity of a separation, on the part of the Christian, from the world of the ungodly and the unbelieving. "Come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean

Stand apart from an apostate world. "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."

In the apostolic and primitive times the church of Christ was one. But, with the strictest internal union, a decided distinction was kept up between the general church and heretics. In fact there never can be any real union of heart among believers, except in the same degree as there is a real separation from infidels. The member of the primitive church stood apart from the unbeliever with holy fear, while the unbeliever said "acknowledge us," and eagerly pressed to be received. And so it must be again. So it one day will be. It cannot be that the Redeemer revisit his church upon earth, till she again be one. To stand apart in this manner may be deemed pharisaical, or even unkind. And those who follow a different course may be called candid by a world which feels itself in no small degree accommodated by their liberality. But, "What communion hath light with darkness? Or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?"

On those various classes of Christians who are comprehended under the name of Orthodox Dissenters, we would especially impress these considerations. We mean those who are not in communion with the establishment, yet so far hold the truth upon essential points, that they may be considered as constituting, with the faithful members of the Church of England, the general Church of Christ. Why, we ask then, should they in any instance form an unnatural alliance, or maintain an unnatural union with men, who deny the supremacy of that Being, to whom they look for salvation? That which should unite the orthodox dissenter with the faithful member of the establishment, is a community of religious principles, a community of faith, a community of hope. That which does, we fear, too often unite him with the unbeliever, is a community of political interests. Would it be found, then, if it came to the pull, that the latter tie is the stronger? We are unwilling to think it possible.—May no secular injustice, no ecclesiastical bigotry, no "spiritual wickedness in high places," no ill-judged abuse from the pulpits of the establishment, retard that re-union, which is so devoutly to be wished and which must some day or other take place, of all the members of Christ's numerous and divided family.

ART. VI.—*Kenilworth. A Romance.* By the Author of “*Waverley, Ivanhoe, &c.*” Three vols. Constable and Co. Edinburgh. 1821.

WE do not intend a serious criticism upon this Romance; having neither room nor inclination for more than a few remarks. The truth is, that when we find literature in any of its departments taking the form of a mere trading adventure, we look upon it as scarcely within our jurisdiction. It becomes rather a subject of calculation than criticism. The author and publisher, in such a case, have the same motive, the same interest, and the same success. If the object of a writer is simply to coin his brain into money; or, in other words, to turn out a saleable performance, he has a right to say to his critic, you must try me with reference to my professed object; my work is good or bad according as it is framed to achieve its purpose: quarrel with my purpose if you please, but I can not be said to have executed my work amiss, if I have made it adequate to the end I proposed to myself in preparing it. Now we cannot but think that this is something like the case of the Author of the Romance of “*Kenilworth.*” But still we must not allow him all the benefit of the argument. There is always so much of genius in whatever he does, and the eminent intellectual station he holds gives him so much power over our national literature and the public taste, that we cannot consider him as franchised from our cognizance by the voluntary degradation of his talents. Some men may escape us like the cuttle fish by muddying the medium through which they move; but the Author of “*Kenilworth*” floats like the dolphin, with his back above the element in which he takes his pastime.

“*Kenilworth*” is a tedious performance. The staple of the story, which is very meagre, is drawn out into thready details of sempiternal prolixity. The event on which it is founded is thus related in Miss Aikin’s very interesting *Memoirs of the court of Elizabeth*:

“Just when the whispered scandal of the court had apprized him how obvious to all beholders the partiality of his sovereign had become;—first, when her rejection of the proposals of so many foreign princes had confirmed the suspicion that her heart had given itself at home;—just, in short, when every thing conspired to sanction hopes, which, under any other circumstances, would have appeared no less visionary than presumptuous,—at the very juncture most favourable to his ambition, but most perilous to his reputation, lord Robert Dudley lost his wife, and by a fate equally sudden and mysterious.

“This unfortunate lady had been sent by her husband, under the conduct of Sir Richard Varney, one of his retainers,—but for what reason, or under what pretext does not appear;—to *Culnor House*,

... solitary mansion inhabited by Anthony Foster, also a dependent of Dudley's, and bound to him by particular obligations. Here she soon after met with her death; and Varney and Forster, who appear to have been alone in the house with her, gave out that it happened by an accidental fall down stairs; but this account, from various causes, gained so little credit in the neighbourhood, that reports of the most sinister import were quickly propagated. These discourses soon reached the ears of Thomas Lever, a prebendary of Coventry, and a very conscientious person, who immediately addressed to the secretaries of state an earnest letter, still extant, beseeching them to cause strict inquiry to be made into the case, as it was commonly believed that the lady had been murdered; but he mentioned no particular grounds of this belief; and it cannot now be ascertained whether any steps were taken in consequence of his application. If there were, they certainly produced no satisfactory explanation of the circumstance; for not only the popular voice, which was ever hostile to Dudley, continued to accuse him as the contriver of her fate, but Cecil himself, in a memorandum, drawn up some years after, of reasons against the queen's making him her husband, mentions among other objections, 'that he is infamed by the death of his wife.'

"Whether the thorough investigation of this matter was evaded by the artifices of Dudley, or whether his enemies, finding it impracticable to bring the crime home to him, found it more advisable voluntarily to drop the enquiry; certain it is, that the queen was never brought in any manner to take cognizance of the affair; and that the credit of Dudley continued as high with her as ever. But in the opinion of the country, the favourite passed ever after for a dark designer, capable of perpetrating any secret villany in furtherance of his designs, and skilful enough to conceal his atrocity under a cloak of artifice and hypocrisy impervious to the partial eye of his royal mistress, though penetrated by all the world besides. This idea of his character caused him afterwards to be accused of practising against the lives of several other persons who were observed to perish opportunely for his purposes. Each of these charges will be particularly examined in its proper place; but it ought here to be observed, that not one of them appears to be supported by so many circumstances of probability as the first; and even in support of this no direct evidence has ever been adduced."

Historians are pretty well agreed that the Earl of Leicester was unworthy of his high fortunes. But a favourite is proverbially without a friend, and it is well known that that exalted nobleman had many enemies; it may, therefore, be reasonably doubted, whether his true character has been honestly handed down to us. That he abounded in those dazzling qualities which are so apt to engage the admiration of women, the notorious parts of his history sufficiently attest; and that he excelled in the arts of dissimulation and persuasion can as little be doubted, when it is remembered that he maintained an ascendant interest in the mind of Elizabeth during a period of 30 years, amidst a variety

of faults and failures, personal and political, with enemies in abundance filling the court of his mistress, watching his actions and words, and favoured with opportunities of construing them to his disadvantage.

The Author of the work before us has a genius that will not yield to the stubborn verities of history, nor, indeed, would it consist with the professed purpose of his productions so to do; but we cannot feel that it is quite allowable to take the recorded characters of history for the actors in his imaginary scenes. To bring before us strong and lively portraits of the prevailing manners of any epoch in our annals, by giving a particular date to a story, and accommodating a fictitious narrative to the political events of that period, without any tampering with real events or characters, seems not only a justifiable, but a profitable use of history; it may contribute to a juster and clearer apprehension of the progress of manners and knowledge as they have passed through their several stages, and thus add materially to the interest and attraction of our domestic chronicles; but where the veritable personages, whose actions and principles, moral and political, hold a distinguished place in our records, and who are before the tribunal of posterity for the operative share they have had in transactions, the consequences of which we may be yet experiencing, are made to figure in a fictitious narrative as heroes and heroines, it does appear to us that the authentic truths as well as the retributive justice of history are treated with too little regard. The drama, it is true, has always exercised this right over the property of history; but poetry and history run in a course so different, that there is no danger of their streams intermingling; they are as far apart as fact and effect, feeling and information, actual and possible existence: poetry has a world of her own, over which she rules with a magic sceptre, giving what form or size she pleases to all the beings which are subject to her dominion; but a story in the form of prosaic narrative, and ostensibly an account of things as they happened, sometimes rigidly, sometimes imperfectly true, making little appeal to the imagination, and approaching the heart by the closest semblance of reality, if it assumes for its agents actual historical persons, and adopts attested and notorious facts for the basis of its fiction, encroaches, as it appears to us, somewhat too rudely upon the severe, we had almost said the consecrated and exclusive province, of our National Annals.

Of Leicester, history has given us a pretty correct and consistent portrait. The novel before us, in the warped and fabricated account which it has presented of that artful and ambitious man, has compounded a character of great incongruities, and properties very irreconcilable. He is at once a finished dissem-

bles and a genuine lover, a dastardly courtier, and a redoubted son of chivalry, penetrating and circumspect to a proverb, and the dupe of a most transparent knave; for such Richard Varney, we think, must be taken to be, in spite of the efforts of the author to paint him otherwise. Supposing Leicester to have been anxious to wear out the life of his unhappy lady by ill-treatment, or to get rid of her by some more compendious method, as the case is represented in history, the miscreants to whose keeping he committed her, were properly selected; but the manner of his disposing of her, while he pursued his game of ambition at court, was perfectly at variance with the devoted affection which the novel represents him as entertaining towards her.

Queen Elizabeth's character is exhibited in the broad lines in which history has presented her to posterity. The author of the romance, has taken her much as he found her. She is the Queen Elizabeth upon record; never the mere woman where it was necessary to be the Queen, but the woman thoroughly and emphatically, whenever she could afford or venture to be such. The characteristics both of the woman and the Queen are exhibited, with the exaggerations in which writers of romances claim the privilege of indulging; and we cannot help thinking that the palpable extravagance of some of the compliments addressed to her, look very much like that sort of jesting with the weak part of another, which in the lounge's vocabulary is called "quizzing." After all, however, it must be admitted, that the character of this great Queen, which this book presents, is necessarily very unfinished. We see nothing of her in the great transactions of her reign; and perhaps it was hardly fair towards her memory to represent her only under circumstances to display her foibles.

In those particulars of this gloomy story which history informs us least about, the author is most to be commended, probably because more his own master, and more at liberty to indulge his powerful imagination. The melancholy of Sir Hugh Robsart, the father of Amy, whom, with the aid of Varney, the Earl of Leicester had enticed from her home, and from her first engagements, is depicted with an exquisite pencil. The Earl had married his daughter: though with this fact the father does not appear to have been made acquainted; and both himself, and the young man to whom she had been betrothed, almost to the conclusion of the story, remain under the impression that Varney had been the author of the calamity and the disgrace.

Sir Hugh Robsart is the Sir Roger de Coverley of that day, with a keener addiction to the chase, and a harsher sort of rusticity, blended with the pride of family and martial descent. The description of the gloom into which he falls on account of his daughter's clorment, is in the best style of this master. His

gradual estrangement from all his favourite pursuits, his apathy, forgetfulness, and moody vacancy of spirits, are indicated by the most natural and affecting train of incidents.

The character of Amy herself is the great defect of the performance. It is in no keeping. The general dignity to which it seems to lay claim, has no support from the circumstances of her story, as obscurely traced by the author. It seems that she had been betrothed to Tressilian, a young person of engaging qualities; virtuous, dignified, and brave; but it appears that this amiable person had hurt his interest with her by acting the part of her preceptor, so that she found it impossible to feel for him any higher sentiment than esteem, though her father loved him as his own child. From such a father, and such a lover, the young lady, without much scruple, eloped with a young lord, of whom she could know nothing, but that he was sprung from a stock but little famed for virtuous principles, and was himself a young aspirant after court favour, moving in scenes that left to the secluded maiden little hope of constancy in love, or fidelity in marriage.

All that is graceful, or commanding, or fascinating in woman, is designed to be exemplified in this ill-starred heroine, but we cannot think the author has succeeded in his purpose. The first time the Earl and the fair Amy, his Countess, are brought together before the reader, is in the gloomy mansion at Cumnor, where she resided concealed from the world, under custody of the miscreant, Anthony Foster; and it is thus that the Countess is made to comfort herself.

“There was some little displeasure and confusion on the Countess’s brow, owing to her struggle with Varney’s pertinacity; but it was exchanged for an expression of the purest joy and affection, as she threw herself into the arms of the noble stranger who entered, and clasping him to her bosom, exclaimed, ‘At length—at length thou art come!’

“Varney discreetly withdrew as his lord entered, and Janet was about to do the same, when her mistress signed to her to remain. She took her place at the farther end of the apartment, and remained standing, as if ready for attendance.

“Meanwhile, the Earl, for he was of no inferior rank, returned his lady’s caress with the most affectionate ardour, but affected to resist when she strove to take his cloak from him.

“‘Nay,’ she said, ‘but I will unmantle you—I must see if you have kept your word to me, and come as the great Earl men call thee, and not as heretofore like a private cavalier.’

“‘Thou art like the rest of the world,’ Amy,’ said the Earl, suffering her to prevail in the playful contest; ‘the jewels, and feathers, and silk, are more to them than the man whom they adorn—many a poor blade looks gay in a velvet scabbard.’

“‘But so cannot men say of thee, thou noble Earl,’ said his lady,

as the cloaks dropped on the floor, and shewed him dressed as princes when they ride abroad; "thou art the good and well-trying steel, whose inly worth deserves, yet disdains, its outward ornaments. Do not think Amy can love thee better in this glorious garb, than she did when she gave her heart to him who wore the russet brown cloak in the woods of Devon."

"'And thou too,' said the Earl, as gracefully and majestically he led his beautiful Countess toward the chair of state which was prepared for them both,—'thou too, my love, hast donned a dress which becomes thy rank, though it cannot improve thy beauty. What think'st thou of our court taste?'"

The lady cast a sidelong glance upon the great mirror as they passed it by, and then said, 'I know not how it is, but I think not of my own person, while I look at the reflection of thine. Sit thou there,' she said, as they approached the chair of state, 'like a thing for men to worship and to wonder at.'

"'Ay, love,' said the Earl, 'if thou wilt share my state with me.'

"'Not so,' said the Countess; 'I will sit on this footstool at thy feet, that I may spell over thy splendour, and learn, for the first time, how princes are attired.'

And with a childish wonder, which her youth and rustic education rendered not only excusable but becoming, mixed as it was with a delicate shew of the most tender conjugal affection, she examined and admired from head to foot the noble form and princely attire of him, who formed the proudest ornament of the court of England's Maiden Queen, renowned as it was for splendid courtiers, as well as for wise counsellors. Regarding affectionately his lovely bride, and gratified by her unexpressed admiration, the dark eye and noble features of the Earl expressed passions more gentle than the commanding and aspiring look, which usually sat upon his broad forehead, and in the piercing brilliancy of his dark eye, and he smiled at the simplicity which dictated the questions she put to him concerning the various ornaments with which he was decorated.

"'The embroidered strap, as thou callest it, around my knee,' he said, 'is the English Garter, an ornament which kings are proud to wear. See, here is the star which belongs to it, and here the Diamond George, the jewel of the Order. You have heard how King Edward and the Countess of Salisbury'—"

"'O, I know all that tale,' said the Countess, slightly blushing, 'and how a lady's garter became the proudest badge of English chivalry.'

"'Even so,' said the Earl; 'and this most honourable Order I had the good hap to receive at the same time with three most noble associates, the Duke of Norfolk; the Marquis of Northampton, and the Earl of Rutland. I was the lowest of the four in rank—but what then?—he that climbs a ladder must begin at the first round.'

"'But this other fair collar, so richly wrought, with some jewel like a sheep hung by the middle attached to it, what,' said the young Countess, 'does that emblem signify?'"

"'This collar,' said the Earl, 'with its double fusilles interchanged with these knobs, which are supposed to present flint-stones, sparkling

with fire, and sustaining the jewel you inquire about, is the badge of the noble Order of the Golden Fleece, once appertaining to the House of Burgundy. It hath high privileges, my Amy, belonging to it, this most noble Order; for even the King of Spain himself, who hath now succeeded to the honours and demesnes of Burgundy, may not sit in judgment upon a knight of the Golden Fleece, unless by assistance and consent of the Great Chapter of the Order.'

" 'And is this an Order belonging to the cruel King of Spain?' said the Countess. 'Alas! my noble lord, that you will defile your noble English breast by bearing such an emblem! Bethink you of the most unhappy Queen Mary's days, when this same Philip held sway with her in England, and of the piles which were built for our noblest, and our wisest, and our most truly sanctified prelates and divines—And will you, whom men call the standard-bearer of the true Protestant faith, be contented to wear the emblem and mark of such a Romish tyrant as he of Spain?'

" 'O, content you, my love,' answered the Earl; 'we who spread our sails to gales of court-favour, cannot always display the ensigns we love the best, or at all times refuse sailing under colours which we like not. Believe me, I am not the less good Protestant, that for policy I must accept the honour offered me by Spain, in admitting me to this his highest order of knighthood. Besides, it belongs properly to Flanders; and Egmont, Orange, and others, have pride in seeing it displayed on an English bosom.'

" 'Nay, my lord, you know your own path best,' replied the Countess. — 'And this other collar, to what country does this fair jewel belong?'

" 'To a very poor one, my love,' replied the Earl; 'this is the Order of Saint Andrew, revived by the last James of Scotland. It was bestowed on me when it was thought the young widow of France and Scotland would gladly have wedded an English baron; but a free coronet of England is worth a crown matrimonial held at the humour of a woman, and owning only the poor rocks and bogs of the north.'

" The Countess paused, as if what he last said had excited some painful but interesting train of thought; and, as she still remained silent, the Earl proceeded. ●

" 'And now, loveliest, your wish is gratified, and you have seen your vassal in such of his trim array as accords with riding vestments; for robes of state and coronets are only for princely halls.'

" 'Well, then,' said the Countess, 'my gratified wish has, as usual, given rise to a new one.'

" 'And what is it thou canst ask that I can deny?' said the fond husband.

" 'I wished to see my Earl visit this' obscure and secret bower,' said the Countess, 'in all his princely array, and now, methinks, I long to sit in one of his princely halls, and see him enter dressed in sober russet, as when he won poor Amy Robsart's heart.'

" 'That is a wish easily granted,' said the Earl—'the sober russet shall be donned to-morrow if you will.'

" 'But shall I,' said the lady, 'go with you to one of your castles, to see how the richness of your dwelling will correspond with your peasant habit?'

“ ‘Wny, Amy,’ said the Earl, looking around, ‘are not these apartments decorated with sufficient splendour? I gave the most unbounded order, and, methinks, it has been indifferently well obeyed—but if thou canst tell me aught which remains to be done, I will instantly give direction.’

“ ‘Nay, my lord, now you mock me,’ replied the Countess; ‘the gaiety of this rich lodging exceeds my imagination as much as it does my desert. But shall not your wife, my love—at least one day soon—be surrounded with the honour, which arises neither from the toils of the mechanic who decks her apartment, nor from the silks and jewels with which your generosity adorns her, but which is attached to her place among the matronage, as the avowed wife of England’s noblest Earl?’

“ ‘One day?’ said her husband,—‘Yes, Amy, my love, one day this shall surely happen; and, believe me, thou canst not wish for that day more fondly than I. With what rapture could I retire from labours of state, and cares and toils of ambition, to spend my life in dignity and honour on my own broad domains, with thee, my lovely Amy, for my friend and companion! But, Amy, this cannot yet be; and these dear but stolen interviews, are all I can give to the loveliest and the best beloved of her sex.’ ” (Vol. i. p. 146—154.)

We cannot say that the above conversation is just that which is calculated to raise our respect for this young female to the height which is required to enable her to carry all our sympathies along with her. At another time we have the following portrait of the heroine.

“Varney entered her dressing apartment, where she sat arrayed in her native loveliness, adorned with all that Janet’s art, and a rich and tasteful undress, could bestow. But the most beautiful part of her attire was her beautiful and luxuriant light-brown locks, which floated in such rich abundance around a neck that resembled a swan’s, and over a bosom heaving with anxious expectation, which communicated a hurried tinge of red to her whole countenance.” (Vol. ii. 240, 241.)

These minute descriptions of dress and deportment are very frequent in most of this author’s romances, and we think they are among his least pardonable excesses, because they appear to be too much connected with the art of expanding his matter to the complement of a certain number of pages, in fulfilment of the bookseller’s expectations.

It is not very easy to represent a young lady under the influence of violent anger without some expense to the charms of her person. This author has ventured upon the undertaking to combine the graces and the furies in a subserviency to the expression of exalted beauty in the following description.

“When they entered the apartment, Varney stood by the door grinding his teeth, with an expression in which rage, and shame, and

fear, had each their share. The Countess stood in the midst of her apartment like a juvenile Pythoness, under the influence of the prophetic fury. The veins in her beautiful forehead started into swollen blue lines through the hurried impulse of her articulation—her cheek and neck glowed like scarlet—her eyes were like those of an imprisoned eagle, flashing red lightning on the foes whom it cannot reach with its talons. Were it possible for one of the graces to have been animated by a Fury, the countenance could not have united such beauty with so much hatred, scorn, defiance, and resentment. The gesture and attitude corresponded with the voice and looks, and altogether presented a spectacle which was at once beautiful and fearful; so much of the sublime had the energy of passion united with the Countess Amy's natural loveliness. Janet, as soon as the door was open, ran to her mistress; and more slowly, yet with more haste than he was wont, Anthony Foster went to Richard Varney.

“ ‘In the Truth's name, what ails your ladyship?’ said the former.

“ ‘What, in the name of Satan, have you done to her?’ said Foster to his friend.

“ ‘Who, I?—nothing,’ answered Varney, but with sunken head and sullen voice; ‘nothing but communicated to her her lord's commands, which if the lady list not to obey, she knows better how to answer it than I may pretend to do.’

“ ‘Now, by Heaven, Janet!’ said the Countess, ‘the false traitor lies in his throat! He must needs lie, for he speaks to the dishonour of my noble lord—he must needs lie doubly, for he speaks to gain ends of his own, equally execrable and unattainable.’

“ ‘You have misapprehended me, lady,’ said Varney, with a sulky species of submission and apology; ‘let this matter rest till your passion be abated, and I will explain all.’

“ ‘Thou shalt never have an opportunity to do so,’ said the Countess.—‘Look at him, Janet. He is fairly dressed, hath the outside of a gentleman, and hither he came to persuade me it was my lord's pleasure—nay, more, my wedded lord's commands, that I should go with him to Kenilworth, and before the Queen and nobles, and in presence of my own wedded lord, that I should acknowledge him—*him* there—that very cloak-brushing, shoe-cleaning fellow—*him* there, my lord's lacquey, for my liege lord and husband; furnishing against myself, great God! whenever I was to claim my right and my rank, such weapons as would hew my just claim from the root, and destroy my character to be regarded as an honourable matron of the English nobility!’

“ ‘You hear her, Foster, and you, young maiden, hear this lady,’ answered Varney, taking advantage of the pause which the Countess had made in her charge, more for lack of breath than for lack of matter.—‘You hear that her heat only objects to me the course which our good lord, for the purpose to keep certain matters secret, suggests in the very letter which she holds in her hands.’

“ Foster here attempted to interfere with a face of authority, which he thought became the charge entrusted to him, ‘Nay, lady, I must needs say you are hasty in this—Such deceit is not utterly to be con-

denied when practised for a righteous end; and thus even the patriarch Abraham feigned Sarah to be his sister when they went down to Egypt."

"*'Ay, sir,'* answered the Countess; *'but God rebuked that deceit even in the father of his chosen people, by the mouth of the heathen Pharaoh. Out upon you, that will read Scripture only to copy those things which are held out to us as warnings, not as examples!'*

"*'But Sarah disputed not the will of her husband, an it be your pleasure,'* said Foster, in reply; *'but did as Abraham commanded, calling herself his sister, that it might be well with her husband for her sake, and that his soul might live because of her beauty.'*

"*'Now, so Heaven pardon me my useless anger,'* answered the Countess, *'thou art as daring a hypocrite as yonder fellow is an impudent deceiver. Never will I believe that the noble Dudley gave countenance to so dastardly, so dishonourable a plan. Thus I tread on his infamy, if his indeed it be, and thus destroy its remembrance for ever!'*

"So saying, she tore in pieces Leicester's letter, and stamped, in the extremity of impatience, as if she would have annihilated the minute fragments into which she had rent it.

"*'Bear witness,'* said Varney, collecting himself, *'she has torn my lord's letter, in order to burthen me with the scheme of his devising; and although it promises nought but danger and trouble to me, she would lay it to my charge, as if I had any purpose of mine own in it.'*

"*'Thou liest, thou treacherous slave!'* said Countess Avey, in spite of Janet's attempts to keep her silent, in the sad foresight that her vehemence might only furnish arms against herself. *'Thou liest,'* she continued—*'Let me go, Janet—Were it the last word I have to speak, he lies—he had his own foul ends to seek; and broader he would have displayed them, had my passion permitted me to preserve the silence which at first encouraged him to unfold his vile projects.'*

"*'Madam,'* said Varney, overwhelmed in spite of his effrontery, *'I entreat you to believe yourself mistaken.'*

"*'As soon will I believe light darkness. Have I drank of oblivion? Do I not remember former passages, which, known to Leicester, had given thee the preferment of a gallows, instead of the honour of his intimacy.—I would I were a man but for five minutes! It were space enough to make a craven like thee confess his villainy. But go—begone—Tell thy master, that when I take the foul course to which such scandalous deceptions as thou hast recommended on his behalf must necessarily lead me, I will give him a rival something worthy of the name. He shall not be supplanted by an ignominious lacquey, whose best fortune is to catch his master's last suit of clothes ere it is threadbare, and who is only fit to seduce a suburb-wench by the bravery of new roses in his master's old pantofles. Go, begone, sir—I scorn thee so much, that I am ashamed to have been angry with thee.'*"—
(Vol. ii. p. 244—250.)

There is, however, a considerable sprinkling of passages to be found in these volumes, in which the genius of the author asserts its high pretensions, and we lament that the little room we have to spare will not allow us to do him more justice by our extracts. We will, however, present to our readers one of these passages, in which the skill of this great artist, in exciting and sustaining the fever of breathless solicitude, and supreme emotion, is eminently displayed. It is in the interview which takes place during the fête at Kenilworth between the Earl and Countess, after a series of distressing misadventures and disappointments.

"Leicester, as it seemed to him, had reason to be angry with his lady for transgressing his commands, and thus placing him in the perilous situation in which he had that morning stood. But what displeasure could keep its ground before these testimonies of affection from a being so lovely, that even the negligence of dress, and the withering effects of fear and grief, which would have impaired the beauty of others, rendered her's but the more interesting. He received and repaid her caresses with fondness, mingled with melancholy, the last of which she seemed scarcely to observe, until the first transport of her own joy was over; when, looking anxiously in his face, she asked if he was ill.

"Not in my body, Amy,' was his answer.

"Then I will be well too.—O Dudley! I have been ill!—very ill, since we last met!—for I call not this morning's horrible vision a meeting. I have been in sickness, in grief, and in danger—But thou art come, and all is joy, and health, and safety."

"Alas! Amy,' said Leicester, 'thou hast undone me!'

"I, my lord,' said Amy, her cheek at once losing its transient flush of joy—'how could I injure that which I love better than myself?'

"I would not upbraid you, Amy,' replied the Earl; 'but are you not here contrary to my express commands—and does not your presence here endanger both yourself and me?'

"Does it, does it indeed!' she exclaimed eagerly; 'then why am I here a moment longer? O if you knew by what fears I was urged to quit Cumnor Place!—but I will say nothing of myself—only that if it might be otherwise, I would not willingly return *thither*;—yet if it concern your safety——'

"We will think, Amy, of some other retreat,' said Leicester; 'and you shall go to one of my Northern castles, under the personage,—it will be but needful, I trust, for a very few days—of Varney's wife.'

"How, my Lord of Leicester!' said the lady, disengaging herself from his embraces; 'is it to your wife you give the dishonourable counsel to acknowledge herself the bride of another—and of all men, the bride of that Varney?'

"Madam, I speak it in earnest—Varney is my true and faithful servant, trusted in my deepest secrets. I had better lose my right

hand than his service at this moment. You have no cause to scorn him as you do.'

" 'I could assign one, my lord,' replied the Countess; 'and I see he shakes even under that assured look of his. But he that is necessary as your right hand to your safety, is free from any accusation of mine. May he be true to you; and that he may be true, trust him not too much or too far. But it is enough to say, that I will not go with him unless by violence, nor would I acknowledge him as my husband, were all——'

" 'It is a temporary deception, madam,' said Leicester, irritated by her opposition, 'necessary for both our safeties, endangered by you through female caprice, or the premature desire to seize on a rank to which I gave you title, only under condition that our marriage, for a time, should continue secret. If my proposal disgust you, it is yourself has brought it on both of us. There is no other remedy—you must do what your own impatient folly hath rendered necessary—I command you.'

" 'I cannot put your commands, my lord,' said Amy, 'in balance with those of honour and conscience. I will *not*, in this instance, obey you. You may achieve your own dishonour, to which these crooked policies naturally tend, but I will do nought that can blemish mine. How could you again, my lord, acknowledge me as a pure and chaste matron, worthy to share your fortunes, when, holding that high character, I had strolled the country the acknowledged wife of such a profligate fellow as your servant Varney!'

" 'My lord,' said Varney interposing, 'my lady is too much prejudiced against me, unhappily, to listen to what I can offer; yet it may please her better than what she proposes. She has good interest with Master Edmund Tressilian, and could doubtless prevail on him to consent to be her companion to Lidcote-hall, and there she might remain in safety until time permitted the developement of this mystery.'

" Leicester was silent, but stood looking eagerly on Amy, with eyes which seemed suddenly to glow as much with suspicion as displeasure.

" 'The Countess only said, 'Would to God I were in my father's house!—When I left it, I little thought I was leaving peace of mind and honour behind me.'

" 'Varney proceeded with a tone of deliberation, 'Doubtless this will make it necessary to take strangers into my lord's counsels; but surely the Countess will be warrant for the honour of Master Tressilian, and such of her father's family——'

" 'Peace, Varney,' said Leicester; 'by Heaven I will strike my dagger into thee, if again thou namest Tressilian as a partner of my counsels!'

" 'And wherefore not?' said the Countess; 'unless they be counsels fitter for such as Varney, than for a man of stainless honour and integrity.—My lord, my lord, bend no angry brows on me—it is the truth, and it is I who speak it. I once did Tressilian wrong for your sake—I will not do him the further injustice of being silent when his honour is brought in question. I can forbear,' she said, looking at Varney, 'to pull the mask off hypocrisy, but I will not permit virtue to be slandered in my hearing.'

"There was a dead pause. Leicester stood displeased, yet undetermined, and too conscious of the weakness of his cause; while Varney, with a deep and hypocritical affectation of sorrow, mingled with humility, bent his eyes on the ground.

"It was then that the Countess Amy displayed, in the midst of distress and difficulty, the natural energy of character, which would have rendered her, had fate allowed, a distinguished ornament of the rank which she held. She walked up to Leicester with a composed step, a dignified air, and looks in which strong affection assayed in vain to shake the firmness of conscious truth and rectitude of principle. 'You have spoke your mind, my lord,' she said, 'in these difficulties with which, unhappily, I have found myself unable to comply. This gentleman—this person I would say—has hinted at another scheme, to which I object not but as it displeases you. Will your lordship be pleased to hear what a young and timid woman, but your most affectionate wife, can suggest in the present extremity?'

"Leicester was silent, but bent his head towards the Countess, as an intimation that she was at liberty to proceed.

" 'There hath been but one cause for all these evils, my lord,' she proceeded, 'and it resolves itself into the mysterious duplicity with which you have been induced to surround yourself. Extricate yourself at once, my lord, from the tyranny of these disgraceful trammels. Be like a true English gentleman, knight, and earl, who holds that truth is the foundation of honour, and that honour is dear to him as the breath of his nostrils. Take your ill-fated wife by the hand, lead her to the footstool of Elizabeth's throne—Say, that in a moment of infatuation, moved by supposed beauty, of which none perhaps can now trace even the remains, I gave my hand to this Amy Robsart.—You will then have done justice to me, my lord, and to your own honour; and should law or power require you to part from me, I will oppose no objection—since I may then with honour hide a grieved and broken heart in those shades from which your love withdrew me.'

"There was so much of dignity, so much of tenderness in the Countess's remonstrance, that it moved all that was noble and generous in the soul of her husband. The scales seemed to fall from his eyes, and the duplicity and tergiversation of which he had been guilty, stung him at once with remorse and shame.

" 'I am not worthy of you, Amy,' he said, 'that could weigh aught which ambition has to give against such a heart as thine. I have a bitter penance to perform, in disentangling, before sneering foes, and astounded friends, all the meshes of my own deceitful policy.—And the Queen—but let her take my head, as she has threatened.'

" 'Your head, my lord!' said the Countess; 'because you used the freedom and liberty of an English subject in chusing a wife? For shame; it is this distrust of the Queen's justice, this apprehension of danger, which cannot but be imaginary, that, like scare-crows, have induced you to forsake the straight-forward path, which, as it is the best, is also the safest.'

" 'Ah, Amy, thou little knowest!' said Dudley; but, instantly checking himself, he added, 'Yet she shall not find in me a safe or easy

victim of arbitrary vengeance—I have friends—I have allies—I will not, like Norfolk, be dragged to the block, as a victim to sacrifice. Fear not, Amy; thou shalt see Dudley bear himself worthy of his name. I must instantly communicate with some of those friends on whom I can best rely; for, as things stand, I may be made prisoner in my own Castle.’

“ ‘O, my good lord,’ said Amy, ‘make no faction in a peaceful state! There is no friend can help us so well as our own candid truth and honour. Bring but these to our assistance, and you are safe amidst a whole army of the envious and malignant. Leave these behind you, and all other defence will be fruitless—Truth, my noble lord, is well painted unarmed.’

“ ‘But Wisdom, Amy,’ answered Leicester, ‘is arrayed in panoply of proof. Argue not with me on the means I shall use to render my confession—since it must be called so—as safe as may be; it will be fraught with enough of danger, do what we will.—Varney, we must hence.—Farewell, Amy, whom I am to vindicate as mine own, at an expence and risk of which thou alone could’st be worthy. You shall soon hear farther from me.’ ” (Vol. iii. 186—195.)

We find it quite impossible to extend our remarks upon this fresh emanation from the brain of this inexhaustible story-teller. The intervals between his productions are indeed scarcely long enough to allow us to finish the perusal of one before another challenges its place. An inventive faculty so redundant, so teeming and swarming with products and births, was never yet displayed to the world; it is in itself a great curiosity, and may well engage the attention of craniologists, in ascertaining the conformation by which Nature provided room for this prodigious intellectual laboratory. It is not to be dissembled, however, that something is sacrificed to this precipitancy of authorship. Much that this writer has produced is crude and ill-concocted. The volumes before us are evidently done in a spirit of book-making, not quite consistent with the dignity of genius, or the respect due to that countless multitude by whom he is read and rewarded.

ART. VII.—BELZONI'S DISCOVERIES IN EGYPT AND NUBIA, &c.

1. *Narrative of the Operations and recent Discoveries within the Pyramids, Temples, Tombs, and Excavations in Egypt and Nubia; and of a Journey to the Coast of the Red Sea, in search of the Ancient Berenice; and another to the Oasis of Jupiter Ammon.* By G. Belzoni. 4to. London, 1820.

2. *Plates, illustrative of the Researches and Operations of G. Belzoni, in Egypt and Nubia.* Atlas folio. London, 1820.

3. *Remarks on the Pyramid of Cephrenes, lately opened by Mr. Belzoni.* By George Stanley Faber, B. D., Rector of Long Newton. 8vo. London, 1819.

THE great antiquity of Egypt, the various revolutions which it has undergone, the wonders of its great river, its pyramids, and other amazing monuments of magnificence, have long been the admiration of the world, and the object of curious and inquisitive research. Notwithstanding much has been done by Norden, Pococke, Shaw, Denon, Hamilton, Legh, Burchardt, and others, whose general accounts of Egypt have left scarcely any thing to be desired concerning its manners and customs; yet it was reserved for the zealous and persevering efforts of Mr. Belzoni to achieve what his predecessors could not accomplish, and to bring to light many valuable and hidden stores of Egyptian antiquity. The celebrity and success of his exertions long preceded his return into Europe, though some petty attempts were made, in certain French journals, to deprive him (in part at least) of his well-earned reputation: and the perusal of his volume will not disappoint the expectations of curiosity.

Mr. Belzoni is a native of Padua, descended from a family originally from Rome. Compelled by the troubles of Italy, in 1800, to quit the place of his birth, he passed his younger days in the former abode of his ancestors, where he was preparing to become a monk: but the sudden entrance of the French army into Rome checked the course of his education, and made him a wanderer ever since. Having spent nine years in England, he proceeded to the south of Europe; and, at Malta, meeting with an agent of the Pasha (or, as Mr. Belzoni invariably terms him, the Bashaw) of Egypt, he embarked for Alexandria, on a project of constructing hydraulic machines, for which his previously-acquired knowledge peculiarly qualified him, in order to irrigate the fields by an easier and more economical system than that which is at present in use in that country. In

June, 1815, Mr. and Mrs. Belzoni arrived at Alexandria; and after some little delay, caused by the prevalence of the plague, he was at length introduced to the Pasha, Mahomet Ali, who received him very civilly. An arrangement was concluded, and Mr. Belzoni undertook to erect a machine, which should raise as much water with one ox, as the machines of the country do with four. A mutiny among the Bashaw's troops having been quelled, our enterprizing author resumed his hydraulic labours in the garden of the Pasha, at Soubra, on the Nile, three miles from Cairo. The failure of his project is thus described, interspersed with some characteristic anecdotes of his employer:

"We went to reside there, in a small house within the walls of the governor's palace, which was closed at night by large gates, something like the *Occales* in Alexandria. I had many provoking difficulties to encounter, before I became acquainted with the people of the place, as they supposed, that the introduction of such machines into the country would throw many of them out of work; consequently I was not welcome among them; and the very persons who were to furnish me with what was necessary in wood, iron, carpentry, &c. would be the first to suffer by it, if the machine succeeded. It may, therefore, easily be imagined that I had to contend with many obstacles, besides the prejudice against all strangers, or innovations in the customs of the natives. As a proof of this may be cited the hydraulic machine already in Soubra, sent as a present from England to the Bashaw of Egypt, which is said to have cost ten thousand pounds. It was neatly put up, though the engineer, who was in charge of it, met with many difficulties before he effected it. At last it was set to work; but as it was imagined, that an English machine would inundate the whole country in an hour, the quantity of water raised was not adequate to their expectation, and it has been left useless ever since. For my own part, I have no doubt, that the machine might have been made to draw up more water, if the person who constructed it could have seen the place and situation in which it was to act. The failure in this instance had given me an early surmise of what might be my own fate; and I was not mistaken.

"During my stay at Soubra, I became acquainted with many Turks, and in particular with the governor of the palace, as we had our house within his walls. The garden of the Bashaw was under his care, and a guard was kept at the gates. The scraglio is so situated, that the front looks over the hill: at the back of it is the garden, which is under the care of Greeks, who in a few years have brought it to great perfection. There are beautiful alcoves, made in form of cupolas, entirely covered with plants; and the water machines, which are constantly at work, keep up a perpetual verdure. There is a fountain in the European style, and a great quantity of fruit, particularly grapes and peaches; but they never grow to any size like ours, for many get rotten and fall before they are ripe; in consequence, the Turks eat them green.

"The Bashaw is in continual motion, being sometimes at his citadel, and sometimes at his seraglio in the Esbakie; but Soubra is his principal residence. His chief amusement is in the evening a little before sunset, when he quits his seraglio, and seats himself on the bank of the Nile, to fire at an earthen pot, with his guards. If any of them hit it, he makes him a present, occasionally of forty or fifty rubies. He is himself an excellent marksman; for I saw him fire at and hit a pot only fifteen inches high, set on the ground on the opposite side of the Nile, though the river at Soubra is considerably wider than the Thames at Westminster Bridge. As soon as it is dark, he retires into the garden, and reposes either in an alcove, or by the margin of a fountain, on an European chair, with all his attendants round him. Here his numerous buffoons keep him in continual high spirits and good humour. By moonlight the scene was beautiful. I was admitted into the garden whenever I wished, by which means I had an opportunity of observing the domestic life of a man, who from nothing rose to be viceroy of Egypt, and conqueror of the most powerful tribes of Arabia.

"From the number of lights I frequently saw through the windows of the seraglio, I supposed the ladies were at such times amusing themselves in some way or other. Dancing women are often brought to divert them, and sometimes the famous Catalani of Egypt was introduced. One of the buffoons of the Bashaw took it into his head one day, for a frolic, to shave his beard; which is no trifle among the Turks; for some of them, I really believe, would sooner have their head cut off than their beard: he borrowed some Franks' clothes of the Bashaw's apothecary, who was from Europe, and, after dressing himself in our costume, presented himself to the Bashaw as a European, who could not speak a single word either of Turkish or Arabic, which is often the case. Being in the dark, the Bashaw took him for what he represented himself to be, and sent immediately for the interpreter, who put some questions to him in Italian, which he did not answer: he was then questioned in French, but no reply; and next in the German and Spanish languages, and still he was silent: at last, when he saw that they were all deceived, the Bashaw not excepted, he burst out in plain Turkish, the only language he was acquainted with, and his well known voice told them who he was; for such was the change of his person, particularly by the cutting off his beard, that otherwise they could scarcely have recognised him. The Bashaw was delighted with the fellow; and, to keep up the frolic, gave him an order on the treasury for an enormous sum of money, and sent him to the Kaciabay, to present himself as a Frank, to receive it. The Kaciabay started at the immensity of the sum, as it was nearly all that the treasury could furnish: but upon questioning this new European, it was soon perceived who he was. In this attire he went home to his women, who actually thrust him out of the door; and such was the disgrace of cutting off his beard, that even his fellow buffoons would not eat with him till it was grown again.

"The Bashaw seems to be well aware of the benefits that may be derived from his encouraging the arts of Europe in his country, and

had already reaped some of the fruits of it. The fabrication of gunpowder, the refining of sugar, the making of fine indigo, and the silk manufacture, are introduced, much to his advantage: he is constantly inquiring after something new, and is delighted with any thing strange to his imagination. Having heard of electricity, he sent to England for two electric machines, one with a plate, the other with a cylinder. The former was broken by the way; the latter was dismantled. The physician of the Bashaw, an Armenian, did not know, though it was so easy a matter, how to set it up. Happening to be at the garden one evening, when they were attempting it, and could not succeed, I was requested to put the several pieces together; and, having done so, I made one of the soldiers mount on the insulating stool, charged the machine, and gave the Turk a good shock; who, expecting no such thing, uttered a loud cry, and jumped off, as much terrified as if he had seen the devil. The Bashaw laughed at the man's jumping off, supposing his fright to be a trick, and not the effect of the machine; and when told, that it was actually occasioned by the machine, he affirmed positively that it could not be, for the soldier was at such a distance, that it was impossible the small chain he held in his hand could have such power. I then desired the interpreter to inform his Highness, that if he would mount the stool himself, he would be convinced of the fact. He hesitated for a while whether to believe me or not; however he mounted the stool. I charged well, put the chain into his hand, and gave him a pretty smart shock. He jumped off, like the soldier, on feeling the effect of the electricity; but immediately threw himself on the sofa in a fit of laughter, not being able to conceive how the machine could have such power on the human body." (P. 12—16.)

The hydraulic "machine was set to work; and although constructed with bad wood and bad iron, and erected by Arabian carpenters and bricklayers, it was a question whether it did not draw six or seven times as much water as the common machines. The Bashaw, after long consideration, gave his decision; and declared, that it drew up only four times as much. It is to be observed, that the water produced by this machine was measured by comparison with the water procured by six of their own; and that, at the time of measuring, the Arabs urged their animals at such a rate, that they could not have continued their exertion above an hour; and for the moment they produced nearly double the quantity of water, that was usually obtained. Notwithstanding all this, the calculation of the Bashaw was to my satisfaction, as it decided on the accomplishment of my undertaking. Still Mahommed Ali perceived plainly the prejudice among the Arabs, and some of the Turks, who were concerned in the cultivation of the land; for instead of four hundred people, and four hundred oxen, they would have only to command one hundred of each, which would make a considerable difference in their profits: but, as it happened, an accident occurred, that put an end to all their fears.

The Bashaw took it into his head to have the oxen taken out of the wheel, in order to see, by way of frolic, what effect the machine

would have by putting fifteen men into it. James, the Irish lad in my service, entered along with them; but no sooner had the wheel turned once round, than they all jumped out, leaving the lad alone in it. The wheel, of course, overbalanced by the weight of the water, turned back with such velocity, that the catch was unable to stop it. The lad was thrown out, and in the fall broke one of his thighs. I contrived to stop the wheel before it did farther injury, which might have been fatal to him. The Turks have a belief, that, when such accidents happen in the commencement of any new invention, it is a bad omen. In consequence of this, exclusive of the prejudice against the machine itself, the Bashaw had been persuaded to abandon the affair. It had been stated to him, also, that it cost as much as four of the usual machines in making, while nothing was said of the advantages as to the oxen, that would be saved in the working of it. The business ended in this manner; and all that was due to me from the Bashaw was consigned to oblivion, as well as the stipulation I had made with him." (P. 22—24.)

Thus disappointed in the object of his speculation, Mr. Belzoni listened to the suggestions of Mr. Salt, the British consul at Cairo, and of the late enterprising traveller, Mr. Burchardt; and departed for Thebes, for the purpose of conveying to Alexandria the colossal head of young Memnon, which is now deposited in the British Museum. In his way thither he stopped to examine the celebrated temple of Tentyra. Dendera,—the ancient Tentyra,—lies on the western bank of the Nile, near the extremity of a fertile plain, bounded by an extensive forest of palms and dates, which furnishes the greater part of Egypt with charcoal. The ruins of ancient Tentyra, which lie a little to the west of the modern town, are of considerable extent. The remains of three temples still exist: the largest of these, which was visited by Mr. Belzoni, is in a fine state of preservation, and surrounded by high mounds of rubbish belonging to the old city. This beautiful remain of Egyptian architecture is thus described:

"The enormous masses of stone employed in the edifice are so well disposed, that the eye discovers the most just proportion every where. The majestic appearance of its construction, the variety of its ornaments, and, above all, the singularity of its preservation, had such an effect on me, that I seated myself on the ground, and for a considerable time was lost in admiration. It is the first Egyptian temple the traveller sees on ascending the Nile, and it is certainly the most magnificent. It has an advantage over most others, from the good state of preservation it is in; and I should have no scruple in saying, that it is of a much later date than any other. The superiority of the workmanship gives us sufficient reason to suppose it to be of the time of the first Ptolemy; and it is not improbable, that he, who laid the foundation of the Alexandrian library, instituted the philosophical society of the Museum, and studied to render himself beloved by his

people, might erect such an edifice, to convince the Egyptians of his superiority of mind over the ancient kings of Egypt, even in religious devotion.

"This is the cabinet of the Egyptian arts, the product of study for many centuries, and it was here that Denon thought himself in the sanctuary of the arts and sciences. The front is adorned with a beautiful cornice, and a frieze covered with figures and hieroglyphics, over the centre of which the winged globe is predominant, and the two sides are embellished with compartments of sacrifices and offerings. The columns that form the portico are twenty-four in number, divided into four rows, including those in the front. On entering the gate the scene changes, and requires more minute observation. The quadrangular form of the capitals first strikes the eye. At each side of the square there is a colossal head of the goddess Isis with cows' ears. There is not one of these heads but is much mutilated, particularly those on the columns in the front of the temple facing the outside: but notwithstanding this disadvantage, and the flatness of their form, there is a simplicity in their countenance that approaches to a smile. The shafts of the columns are covered with hieroglyphics and figures, which are in basso relievo, as are all the figures in the front and lateral walls. The front of the door-way, which is in a straight line with the entrance and the sanctuary, is richly adorned with figures of smaller size than the rest of the portico. The ceiling contains the zodiac, inclosed by two long female figures, which extend from one side to the other of it. The walls are divided into several square compartments, each containing figures representing deities, and priests in the act of offering or immolating victims. On all the walls, columns, ceiling, or architraves, there is nowhere a space of two feet, that is not covered with some figures of human beings, animals, plants, emblems of agriculture, or of religious ceremony. Wherever the eyes turn, wherever the attention is fixed, every thing inspires respect and veneration, heightened by the solitary situation of this temple, which adds to the attraction of these splendid recesses. The inner apartments are much the same as the portico, all covered with figures in basso relievo, to which the light enters through small holes in the walls: the sanctuary itself is quite dark. In the corner of it I found the door, which leads to the roof by a staircase, the walls of which are also covered with figures in basso relievo. On the top of the temple the Arabs had built a village, I suppose to be the more elevated, and exposed to the air; but it is all in ruins, as no one now lives there. From the top I descended into some apartments on the east side of the temple. There I saw the famous zodiac on the ceiling. The circular form of this zodiac led me to suppose, in some measure, that this temple was built at a later period than the rest, as nothing like it is seen any where else. In the front of the edifice there is a propylæon, not inferior to the works in the temple; and, though partly fallen, it still shows its ancient grandeur. On the left, going from the portico, there is a small temple surrounded by columns. In the inside is a figure of Isis sitting with Orus in her lap, and other female figures, each with a child in her arms, are observable. The capitals of the columns are

adorned with the figure of Typhon. The gallery or portico, that surrounds the temple, is filled up with rubbish to a great height, and walls of unburnt bricks have been raised from one column to another. Farther on, in a right line with the propylæon, are the remains of an hypæthral temple, which form a square of twelve columns, connected with each other by a wall, except at the door-way, which fronts the propylæon. The eastern wall of the great temple is richly adorned with figures in intaglio relevato: they are perfectly finished: the female figures are about four feet high, disposed in different compartments. Behind the temple is a small Egyptian building, quite detached from the large edifice; and from its construction I would venture to say, that it was the habitation of the priests. At some distance from the great temple are the foundations of another, not so large as the first. The propylæon is still standing in good preservation." (P. 33—36.)

It was here that the Hindoo sepoys, who went into Egypt by the Red Sea, to join the army of Lord Hutchinson in 1801, imagined they had found their own temples, and expressed their indignation against the Egyptians for neglecting their deities; thus furnishing a strong proof of that connexion, which the researches of Sir William Jones, and of the Asiatic Society at Calcutta, have shown anciently to have subsisted between Egypt and India.

There is one feature in this splendid ruin, which this indefatigable traveller has omitted to notice, viz. the circumstance of the walls sloping inward. This did not escape the observation of the accurate Denon, who extols this edifice as being executed in the purest style of Egyptian architecture. The aspect of the whole is remarkably simple: for, though it be entirely covered with hieroglyphics, these at a little distance do not break the unity of the general effect. Reluctantly quitting the ruins of Tentyra, Mr. Belzoni proceeded up the Nile to Thebes, where he arrived on the 22d of July, and landed at Luxor on the opposite bank. He immediately directed his attention to the colossal bust which he had to remove. "I found it," says he, "near the remains of its body and chair, with its face upwards, and apparently smiling upon me, at the thought of being taken to England." The expectations which he had formed of it, were exceeded by its beauty, though not by its size. Mr. Belzoni has detailed, in an artless, but interesting manner, the various difficulties which he had to encounter from the Cacheff of Erment, the governor of the Fellahs in the province of Gournou. By perseverance, however, and dexterous management, he ultimately overcame all obstacles, and obtained Arabs to remove the bust, for the trifling remuneration of thirty paras each, or fourpence-halfpenny, English money, per day. A car having been constructed, the first operation was to place the bust upon

it—an undertaking of no small labour, when its weight (not less, perhaps, than twelve tons), and the simplicity of the methods employed, are considered. By means of four levers, the bust was raised, so as to leave a vacancy beneath it, in order to introduce the car. After it was slowly lodged on this, the car was raised in front, so as to admit one of the rollers under it: the same operation was repeated at the back, and the colossus was ready to be pulled up. It was then well secured on the car, and the ropes were so placed, that the power might be divided. Persons were stationed with levers, on each side of the car, to assist occasionally, in case the bust should turn on either side. In this manner it was preserved from falling. Men were distributed in front equally at the four ropes, while others were ready to change the ropes alternately. They commenced their labours on the 27th, and by propelling the bust towards the river, at the rate of from fifty to four hundred yards a day, it was safely placed in a situation ready to be embarked on the 12th of August.

This laborious undertaking having been accomplished, Mr. Belzoni on the following day proceeded to explore a cave, containing a sarcophagus, which the French Consul, M. Drouetti, had discovered and attempted to take away, and had presented to him if he could remove it. His account of this research is full of interest, and as it exhibits a clear display of the fraudulent character of the natives, we shall extract it for the information of our readers.

“ I was conducted into one of those holes, that are scattered about the mountains of Gournou, so celebrated for the quantities of mummies they contain. The Janizary remained without, and I entered, with two Arabs and the interpreter.

“ Previous to our entering the cave, we took off the greater part of our clothes, and, each having a candle, advanced through a cavity in the rock, which extended a considerable length in the mountain, sometimes pretty high, sometimes very narrow, and without any regularity. In some passages we were obliged to creep on the ground, like crocodiles. I perceived, that we were at a great distance from the entrance, and the way was so intricate, that I depended entirely on the two Arabs, to conduct us out again. At length we arrived at a large space, into which many other holes or cavities opened; and after some consideration and examination by the two Arabs, we entered one of these, which was very narrow, and continued downward for a long way, through a craggy passage, till we came where two other apertures led to the interior in a horizontal direction. One of the Arabs then said, ‘ This is the place.’ I could not conceive how so large a sarcophagus, as it had been described to me, could have been taken through the aperture, which the Arab now pointed out. I had no doubt, but these recesses were burial-places, as we continually walked over skulls and other bones: but the sarcophagus could never have entered this recess; for it was so narrow, that, on my attempt to penetrate it, I could not

pass. One of the Arabs, however, succeeded, as did my interpreter; and it was agreed, that I and the other Arab should wait till they returned. They proceeded evidently to a great distance, for the light disappeared, and only a murmuring sound from their voices could be distinguished as they went on. After a few moments, I heard a loud noise, and the interpreter distinctly crying, '*O mon Dieu! mon Dieu! je suis perdu!*' After which, a profound silence ensued. I asked my Arab, whether he had ever been in that place? He replied, 'Never.' I could not conceive what could have happened, and thought the best plan was to return, to procure help from the other Arabs. Accordingly, I told my man to show me the way out again; but, staring at me like an idiot, he said he did not know the road. I called repeatedly to the interpreter, but received no answer; I watched a long time, but no one returned; and my situation was no very pleasant one. I naturally returned through the passages, by which we had come; and, after some time, I succeeded in reaching the place, where, as I mentioned, were many other cavities. It was a complete labyrinth, as all these places bore a great resemblance to the one which we first entered. At last seeing one, which appeared to be the right, we proceeded through it a long way; but by this time our candles had diminished considerably; and I feared, that, if we did not get out soon, we should have to remain in the dark: meantime it would have been dangerous to put one out, to save the other, lest that which was left should, by some accident, be extinguished. At this time we were considerably advanced towards the outside, as we thought; but to our sorrow we found the end of that cavity, without any outlet. Convinced that we were mistaken in our conjecture, we quickly returned towards the place of the various entries, which we strove to regain. But we were then as perplexed as ever, and were both exhausted from the ascents and descents, which we had been obliged to go over. The Arab seated himself, but every moment of delay was dangerous. The only expedient was, to put a mark at the place out of which we had just come, and then examine the cavities in succession, by putting also a mark at their entrance, so as to know where we had been. Unfortunately, our candles would not last through the whole: however, we began our operations.'

"On the second attempt, when passing before a small aperture, I thought I heard the sound of something like the roaring of the sea at a distance. In consequence I entered this cavity; and as we advanced the noise increased, till I could distinctly hear a number of voices all at one time. At last, thank God, we walked out; and, to my no small surprise, the first person I saw was my interpreter. How he came to be there I could not conjecture. He told me, that, in proceeding with the Arab along the passage below, they came to a pit, which they did not see; that the Arab fell into it, and in falling put out both candles. It was then that he cried out, '*Mon Dieu! je suis perdu!*' as he thought he also should have fallen into the pit; but, on raising his head, he saw at a great distance a glimpse of daylight, towards which he advanced, and thus arrived at a small aperture. He then scraped away some loose sand and stones, to widen the place where he came

out, and went to give the alarm to the Arabs, who were at the other entrance? Being all concerned for the man who fell to the bottom of the pit, it was their noise that I heard in the cave. The place by which my interpreter got out was instantly widened; and in the confusion the Arabs did not regard letting me see that they were acquainted with that entrance, and that it had lately been shut up. I was not long in detecting their scheme. The Arabs had intended to show me the sarcophagus, without letting me see the way by which it might be taken out, and then to stipulate a price for the secret. It was with this view they took me such a way round about.

"I found that the sarcophagus was not in reality a hundred yards from the large entrance. The man was soon taken out of the well, but so much hurt in one of his hips, that he went lame ever after." (P. 51—54.)

While Mr. Belzoni waited for a boat from Cairo, to carry away the bust, he determined to continue his voyage up the Nile. On the 18th of August he set off for Esne, which place he reached on the following day; on the 20th he arrived at Edfou (the ancient Apollinopolis Parva); and two days after at Ombos. At the two last mentioned places he met with some beautiful remains of Egyptian art. The temple at Edfou may be compared with that of Tentyra, in point of preservation, and is superior to it in magnitude. The ruins at Ombos, though less extensive, convey a clear idea of their former splendour. The columns of the portico form one of the richest groups of architecture which our author has seen; the hieroglyphics being well executed, and some of them still retaining their colours; on the side next the water are the remains of a smaller temple, the diminished stones of which prove that the Egyptians paid great attention to the proportion of masses, as one of the principal points in the effect for which they were intended.

Ascending from Ombos to Assouan, the ancient Syene, the islands of Elephantine and Philæ, Mr. Belzoni arrived on the 29th at the village of El Kalabshe, where he observed some fine ruins of a temple, similar to those at Tentyra, Philæ, and Edfou; all of which he refers to the time of the Ptolemies: for though there is a great similitude in all the Egyptian edifices, yet there is a certain elegance in the forms of the most recent, which distinguishes them from the older massy and enormous works; whence he is led to think that they were executed by the Egyptians under the direction of the Greeks. From this place he advanced to Ibrim, which was the furthest town visited by Mr. Legh and the Rev. Mr. Smelt. At the distance of three days' journey lie the temples of Ybsambul; the principal of which he afterwards opened. As, however, he could undertake nothing without the permission of Osseyn Cacheff, who was further up the Nile at the village of Iskus, Mr. Belzoni proceeded thither

in order to obtain that chieftain's consent. His inquiries concerning the objects of the traveller's pursuit were very minute: and the required permission was granted, on the latter promising that, if the temple should be full of gold, the Cacheff should have one half; but if it should be full of stones, they should be the exclusive property of Mr. Belzoni. He accordingly returned to Ybsambul, and commenced the operation of removing the accumulated sand; but want of time compelled him to relinquish this undertaking, and he descended the Nile to Thebes; where, after considerable difficulty, he succeeded in embarking the bust of Memnon for Cairo, on the 17th of November. His account of this laborious undertaking is worth extracting.

"It was no easy undertaking to put a piece of granite, of such bulk and weight, on board a boat, that, if it received the weight on one side, would immediately upset; and, what is more, this was to be done without the smallest help of any mechanical contrivance, even a single tackle, and only with four poles and ropes, as the water was about eighteen feet below the bank where the head was to descend. The causeway I had made gradually sloped to the edge of the water close to the boat, and with the four poles I formed a bridge from the bank into the centre of the boat, so that when the weight bore on the bridge, it pressed only on the centre of the boat. The bridge rested partly on the causeway, partly on the side of the boat, and partly on the centre of it. On the opposite side of the boat I put some mats well filled with straw. I necessarily stationed a few Arabs in the boat, and some at each side, with a lever of palm-wood, as I had nothing else. At the middle of the bridge I put a sack filled with sand, that, if the colossus should run too fast into the boat, it might be stopped. In the ground behind the colossus I had a piece of a palm-tree firmly planted, round which a rope was twisted, and then fastened to its car, to let it descend gradually. I set a lever at work on each side, and at the same time that the men in the boat were pulling, others were slackening the ropes, and others shifting the rollers as the colossus advanced.

"Thus it descended gradually from the main-land to the causeway, when it sunk a good deal, as the causeway was made of fresh earth. This, however, I did not regret, as it was better it should be so, than that it should run too fast towards the water; for I had to consider, that, if this piece of antiquity should fall into the Nile, my return to Europe would not be very welcome, particularly to the antiquaries; though I have reason to believe, that some among the great body of its scientific men would rather have seen it sunk in the Nile, than where it now deposited. However, it went smoothly on board. The Arabs who were unanimously of opinion that it would go to the bottom of the river, or crush the boat, were all attention, as if anxious to know the result, as well as to learn how the operation was to be performed; and when the owner of the boat, who considered it as consigned to perdition, witnessed my success, and saw the huge piece of stone, as

he called it, safely on board, he came and squeezed me heartily by the hand. 'Thank heaven!' I exclaimed, and I had reason to be thankful; for I will leave it to the judgment of any engineer, whether it would not be easier to embark a mass ten times larger on board a competent vessel, where all sorts of mechanical powers can be procured, instead of being destitute, as I was, of every thing necessary." (P. 131—133.)

The voyage down the Nile was completed in twenty-four days from Thebes; and after five months and a half continual activity and exertion, he arrived at Cairo, on the 15th of December. Early in January 1817, the bust of Memnon was removed to Alexandria, in order to its ultimate conveyance to England. Having thus finished his operations, and whatever was necessary respecting the bust, he proposed to Mr. Salt, the British Consul, to make another excursion into Upper Egypt and Nubia, to open the temple at Ybsambul. This offer being accepted, Mr. Belzoni embarked once more on the Nile, on the 20th of February 1817, accompanied by Mr. Beechey, the son of the distinguished artist. The narrative of this second journey is extremely interesting; we shall therefore be more minute in our analysis of it.

At Meimond the travellers stopped to attend an Arabian dance, of which we have a pleasing delineation in the thirteenth plate. They were courteously introduced in front of the spectators.

"The performers consisted of about thirty men, all in a row, clapping their hands in concert, so as to form a kind of accompaniment to their song, which consisted of three or four words; and with one foot before the other keeping a sort of perpetual motion, but without changing their positions. Before the men were two women with daggers in their hands, also in continual action, running toward the men and then returning from them with an extraordinary motion, brandishing their daggers, and waving their garments. In this they persevered for such a length of time, that I wondered how they could support the exertion. This is a sort of Bedoween dance, and is the most decent of all that I ever saw in Egypt;—but no sooner was it ended, than in order I suppose to please us, they immediately began another, in the fashion of the country, which fully compensated for the extraordinary modesty of the first: but we returned to our boat more disgusted than pleased with it."

"For three days," he continues, "we had a strong southerly wind, so that we advanced but a few miles, and did not arrive at Minieh till the 5th of March. It was necessary for us to land there, to see Hamet Bey, who has the command over all the boats on the river. He styles himself admiral of the Nile, and thinks himself as great as any British admiral on the sea. One day at a christian party in Cairo, the discourse happened to fall upon Sir Sidney Smith; 'Ah!' said Hamet

Bey, 'Sir Sidney is a very clever man, and holds the same rank as myself.' From this great commander we had to obtain a protection for our Reis, to secure him from having his boat pressed while we employed it. We found him sitting on a wooden bench, attended by two or three of his sailors. He complied with our request, and gave a hint for a bottle of rum. We sent him two, and he made a feast in high glee with them." (P. 143, 144.)

From Minich they proceeded to Eraramoun, the ancient Hermopolis; where, being informed that some agents of the French consul were making a forced march to Thebes, to buy up all the antiquities which the Arabs had collected during the preceding season, Belzoni determined to proceed by land to Thebes. His journey occupied five days and a half, during which he slept only eleven hours. In his progress he met with a body of Bedoween Arabs, on their way to Cairo to enter into the service of the Bashaw, who could find no other expedient for suppressing these freebooters, than offering to give them good pay, horses, and arms, and to send them to Mecca. This proposal, it appears, had its due effect: for all the young men embraced it, leaving the women and old men in the deserts. Their horses were very strong, though not in full flesh, and their riders were clothed with a kind of woollen mantle that covered the head and part of the body. They retain the rude and simple habits of their ancestors. Their tents consist of four sticks set in the ground, about a yard in height, to which one of their shawls is fastened as a cover, with another behind, so as to form a kind of shelter. They generally pitch their camps near a fertile spot, but always at the foot of the desert; so that, in case of a surprise, they may speedily regain their native country. The women were all uncovered, and the children entirely naked. They are very frugal in their diet, and never drink any strong liquors. 'They are Arabs,' says Mr. Belzoni, 'but no more like the Arabs of Egypt than a freeman is like a slave. The Egyptian Arabs are accustomed to obey, but will not do any thing unless compelled by force. They are humbled, because they are continually under the rod; and indolent, because they have no interest in any thing. But the wild Arabs, on the contrary, are constantly in motion, and labour to procure provision for their beasts and themselves; and being in perpetual war with each other, their thoughts are incessantly employed in improving their arts of defence, or in obtaining plunder.'

At Thebes he resumed his excavations, and also at Carnac, where he uncovered a colossal figure in front of the great temple. While his people were at work in other directions, our enterprising traveller seized the opportunity thus presented to him, of examining at leisure the superb ruins of this edifice. His de-

scription of the impressions they produced in his mind is both natural and pleasing.

“In a distant view of them nothing can be seen but the towering propylæa, high portals, and obelisks, which project above the various groups of lofty palm-trees, and even at a distance announce magnificence. On approaching the avenue of sphinxes, which leads to the great temple, the visiter is inspired with devotion and piety: their enormous size strikes him with wonder and respect to the Gods, to whom they were dedicated. They represent lions with heads of rams, the symbols of strength and innocence, the power and purity of the Gods. Advancing farther in the avenue, there stand before it towering propylæa, which lead to inner courts, where immense colossi are seated at each side of the gate, as if guarding the entrance to the holy ground. Still farther on was the magnificent temple dedicated to the great God of the creation. It was the first time that I entered it alone, without being interrupted by the noise of the Arabs, who never leave the traveller an instant. The sun was rising, and the long shades from the various groups of columns extended over these ruins, intermixed with the rays of light striking on these masses in various directions, formed such delightful views all around as baffle description.” (P. 152.)

Mr. Belzoni has given a general idea of these extensive ruins, in one of his engravings, and in another a small sketch of part of the interior of the great temple, as well as of the colossal bust which was uncovered. These must be inspected, in order to form an adequate conception of the grand scale upon which they were executed.

“I was lost,” he continues, “in contemplation of so many objects; and being alone in such a place, my mind was impressed with ideas of such solemnity, that for some time I was unconscious whether I were on terrestrial ground, or in some other planet.

“I had seen the temple of Tentyra, and I still acknowledge, that nothing can exceed that edifice in point of preservation, and in the beauty of its workmanship and sculpture; but here I was lost in a mass of colossal objects, every one of which was more than sufficient, of itself alone, to attract my whole attention. How can I describe my sensations at that moment! I seemed alone in the midst of all that a most sacred in the world; a forest of enormous columns, adorned all round with beautiful figures, and various ornaments, from the top to the bottom; the graceful shape of the lotus, which forms their capitals, and is so well proportioned to the columns, that it gives to the view the most pleasing effect; the gates, the walls, the pedestals, and the architraves, also adorned in every part with symbolical figures in basso relievo and intaglio, representing battles, processions, triumphs, feasts, offerings, and sacrifices, all relating no doubt to the ancient history of the country; the sanctuary, wholly formed of fine red granite, with the various obelisks standing before it, proclaiming to the distant passenger, ‘Here is the seat of holiness;’ the high portals, seen at a distance from the openings, to this vast labyrinth of edifices; the va-

rious groups of ruins of the other temples within sight; these altogether had such an effect upon my soul, as to separate me in imagination from the rest of mortals, exalt me on high over all, and cause me to forget entirely the trifles and follies of life. I was happy for a whole day, which escaped like a flash of lightning; but the obscurity of the night caused me to stumble over one large block of stone, and to break my nose against another, which, dissolving the enchantment, brought me to my senses again. It was quite late when I returned to Luxor, to the hut of an Arab, who ceded to me part of his chamber, and a mat, which afforded me an excellent bed." (P. 152, 153.)

His further researches being prevented by the arrival of the French agents, he returned to Thebes; and, mooring his bark at Luxor, recommenced his operations with what assistance he could obtain. Two objects now jointly claimed his attention, viz. the exploring of the sepulchres of the ancient Egyptians at Gournou, and the prosecution of the excavations at Carnac.

Gournou is a tract of rocks about two miles in length, at the foot of the Libyan mountains, on the west of Thebes, and was the burial-place of the great city of a hundred gates. Every part of these rocks is cut out by art, in the form of large and small chambers, each of which has its separate entrance; and though they are very close to each other, they seldom have any interior communication from one to another. The inhabitants of this region are described as being superior to any other Arabs in cunning and deceit, and the most independent of any in Egypt. They boast that they were the last whom the French were able to subdue, and that, when subdued, they compelled their conquerors to pay them whatever they demanded for their labour. They have refused submission both to the Mamelukes and to the Bashaw: consequently they have undergone the severest punishments, and have been hunted down like wild beasts. Their hiding places in the rocks are almost impregnable.

Into the mansions of the dead of former ages our traveller penetrated; and though the difficulty of visiting these recesses made it impossible to give an adequate description of them and their inhabitants, yet he has succeeded in conveying to his readers some idea of the danger to which he exposed himself in exploring them.

"A traveller is generally satisfied when he has seen the large hall, the gallery, the staircase, and as far as he can conveniently go: besides, he is taken up with the strange works he observes cut in various places, and painted on each side of the walls; so that when he comes to a narrow and difficult passage, or to have to descend to the bottom of a well or cavity, he declines taking such trouble, naturally supposing that he cannot see in these abysses any thing so magnificent as what he sees above, and consequently deeming it useless to proceed any far-

ther. Of some of these tombs many persons could not withstand the suffocating air, which often causes fainting. A vast quantity of dust rises, so fine that it enters into the throat and nostrils, and chokes the nose and mouth to such a degree, that it requires great power of lungs to resist it and the strong effluvia of the mummies. This is not all; the entry or passage, where the bodies are, is roughly cut in the rocks, and the falling of the sand from the upper part or ceiling of the passage causes it to be nearly filled up. In some places there is not more than a vacancy of a foot left, which you must contrive to pass through in a creeping posture like a snail, on pointed and keen stones, that cut like glass. After getting through these passages, some of them two or three hundred yards long, you generally find a more commodious place, perhaps high enough to sit. But what a place of rest! surrounded by bodies, by heaps of mummies in all directions; which, previous to my being accustomed to the sight, impressed me with horror. The blackness of the wall, the faint light given by the candles or torches for want of air, the different objects that surrounded me, seeming to converse with each other, and the Arabs with the candles or torches in their hands, naked and covered with dust, themselves resembling living mummies, absolutely formed a scene that cannot be described. In such a situation I found myself several times, and often returned exhausted and fainting, till at last I became inured to it, and indifferent to what I suffered, except from the dust, which never failed to choke my throat and nose; and though, fortunately, I am destitute of the sense of smelling, I could taste that the mummies were rather unpleasant to swallow. After the exertion of entering into such a place, through a passage of fifty, a hundred, three hundred, or perhaps six hundred yards, nearly overcome, I sought a resting place, found one, and contrived to sit; but when my weight bore on the body of an Egyptian, it crushed it like a band-box. I naturally had recourse to my hands to sustain my weight, but they found no better support; so that I sunk altogether among the broken mummies, with a crash of bones, rags, and wooden cases, which raised such a dust as kept me motionless for a quarter of an hour, waiting till it subsided again. I could not remove from the place, however, without increasing it, and every step I took I crushed a mummy in some part or other. Once I was conducted from such a place to another resembling it, through a passage of about twenty feet in length, and no wider than that a body could be forced through. It was choaked with mummies, and I could not pass without putting my face in contact with that of some decayed Egyptian: but as the passage inclined downwards, my own weight helped me on: however, I could not avoid being covered with bones, legs, arms, and heads rolling from above. Thus I proceeded from one cave to another, all full of mummies piled up in various ways, some standing, some lying, and some on their heads. The purpose of my researches was to rob the Egyptians of their papyri; of which I found a few hidden in their breasts, under their arms, in the space above the knees, or on the legs, and covered by the numerous folds of cloth, that envelop the mummy. The people of Gournou, who make a trade of antiquities of this sort, are very jealous of strangers,

and keep them as secret as possible, deceiving travellers by pretending that they have arrived at the end of the pits, when they are scarcely at the entrance. I could never prevail on them to conduct me into these places till this my second voyage, when I succeeded in obtaining admission into any cave where mummies were to be seen.

" My permanent residence in Thebes was the cause of my success. The Arabs saw that I paid particular attention to the situation of the entrance into the tombs, and that they could not avoid being seen by me when they were at work digging in search of a new tomb, though they are very cautious when any stranger is in Gournou not to let it be known where they go to open the earth; and as travellers generally remain in that place a few days only, they used to leave off digging during that time. If any traveller be curious enough to ask to examine the interior of a tomb, they are ready to show him one immediately, and conduct him to some of the old tombs, where he sees nothing but the grottoes in which mummies formerly had been deposited, or where there are but few, and these already plundered; so that he can form but a poor idea of the real tombs, where the remains were originally placed.

" The people of Gournou live in the entrance of such caves as have already been opened, and, by making partitions with earthen walls, they form habitations for themselves, as well as for their cows, camels, buffaloes, sheep, goats, dogs, &c. I do not know whether it is because they are so few in number, that the government takes so little notice of what they do; but it is certain, that they are the most unruly people in Egypt. At various times many of them have been destroyed, so that they are reduced from three thousand, the number they formerly reckoned, to three hundred, which form the population of the present day. They have no mosque, nor do they care for one; for though they have at their disposal a great quantity of all sorts of bricks, which abound in every part of Gournou, from the surrounding tombs, they have never built a single house. They are forced to cultivate a small tract of land, extending from the rocks to the Nile, about a mile in breadth, and two and a half in length: and even this is in part neglected; for if left to their own will, they would never take a spade in their hands, except when they go to dig for mummies; which they find to be a more profitable employment than agriculture. This is the fault of travellers, who are so pleased the moment they are presented with any piece of antiquity, that, without thinking of the injury resulting from the example to their successors, they give a great deal more than the people really expect. Hence it has arisen, that they now set such an enormous price on antiquities, and in particular on papyri. Some of them have accumulated a considerable sum of money, and are become so indifferent, that they remain idle, unless whatever price they demand be given them; and it is to be observed, that it is a fixed point in their minds, that the Franks would not be so liberal, unless the articles were worth ten times as much as they pay for them.

The Fellahs of Gournou who dig for antiquities are sometimes divided into parties, and have their chiefs over each; so that what is

found by any of the party is sold, and the money divided among them all. They are apparently very true to each other, and particularly in cheating strangers; but when they can find a good opportunity, they do not scruple to cheat each other also." (P. 156—159.)

This knavish disposition Mr. Belzoni illustrates, by relating the manner in which he became the purchaser of two brazen vessels, of singular beauty, which he supposes to have been employed for sacred purposes: their composition is stated to be extremely fine, and their sound not unlike that of the Corinthian brass.

These troglodytes are described as being very happy in their way. It is indeed somewhat singular, to talk of happiness among people who dwell in caves like brutes, or rather, who live in sepulchres 'among the corpses and rags of an ancient nation,' of which they know nothing. Custom, however, as Mr. Belzoni remarks, reconciles all this.

In the course of our author's researches among the sepulchres of Gournou, he made some observations, which prove that Herodotus was misinformed by the Egyptians relative to their mode of embalming. The historian, as our readers doubtless know, has described three modes of embalming. One of these was very costly, the second was of less price, and inferior in point of execution; and the other was still more mean. Such bodies, he adds, as were embalmed in the most expensive manner, on being returned to the relatives of the deceased, were inclosed in a wooden case, made to resemble the human figure, and were placed *erect* against the walls of their repositories for the dead. In this, however, he was evidently misled by the Egyptian priests: for Mr. Belzoni states that in all the pits opened by him, he never saw a single mummy standing. On the contrary, he found them lying regularly in *horizontal* rows, and some were sunk into a cement, which must have been nearly fluid when the cases were placed on it. The mummies of the lower classes were in the proportion of ten to one of those of the better class: they were not buried in cases, but dried (it should seem) in the sun, after undergoing the ordinary process of embalming.

Among these tombs our traveller saw some which contained the mummies of bulls, cows, sheep, monkeys, foxes, crocodiles, birds, and other animals, intermixed with human bodies. Idols were often found; and one tomb was filled with nothing but cats, carefully folded in red and white linen, the head covered by a mask representing the cat, and made of the same kind of linen. It is rather singular that these animals are not found in the tombs of the higher classes; while few, if any papyri are found among those of the lower order. Mr. Belzoni is disposed to think that

Belzoni's Discoveries in Egypt and Nubia.

the three divisions of high, middling, and poorer classes, which were made by Herodotus, will admit of still further distinctions, varying according to the respective opulence of the individuals. The mummies which he concludes were appropriated to the priests, are folded in a manner totally different from the others, and executed with great care, to shew the reverence in which they were held. The tombs of the better classes of people are, of course, superior to the others; some of them are more extensive than the rest, having various apartments adorned with figures representing different actions of life. Funeral processions generally predominate. Agricultural processes, religious ceremonies, together with feasting and other ordinary occurrences, are every where to be seen. In these tombs the smaller idols are occasionally found, together with vases, and ornaments of various descriptions, particularly some of leaf gold, beaten nearly as thin as ours, but of a finer colour. The opportunity thus presented to Mr. Belzoni of exploring these hitherto comparatively unknown repositories of the dead, enabled him to make the following curious observations on the manufactures and elegant arts of the Egyptians.

“The Egyptians were certainly well acquainted with linen manufactures to a perfection equal to our own; for, in many of their figures, we observe their garments quite transparent; and among the folding of the mummies, I observed some cloth quite as fine as our common muslin, very strong, and of an even texture. They had the art of tanning leather, with which they made shoes as well as we do, some of which I found of various shapes. They had also the art of staining the leather with various colours, as we do Morocco, and actually knew the mode of embossing on it, for I found leather with figures impressed on it, quite elevated. I think it must have been done with a hot iron while the leather was damp. They also fabricated a sort of coarse glass, with which they made beads and other ornaments.

“Beside enamelling, the art of gilding was in great perfection among them, as I found several ornaments of the kind. They knew how to cast copper as well as to form it into sheets, and had a metallic composition not unlike our lead, rather softer, but of greater tenacity. It is much like the lead which we see on paper in the tea-chests from China, but much thicker. I found some pieces of it covered on both sides with a thin coat of another metal, which might be taken for silver, but I cannot believe it to be so. It certainly is a proof of the scarcity of this metal in Egypt, where, in my opinion, it was less common than gold; for it is seldom found, whereas the latter is quite common on the ornaments.

“Carved works were very common, and in great perfection, particularly the proportion of the figures; and it is to be observed, that though the Egyptians were unacquainted with anatomy, yet in these, as well as in their statues of marble, they preserved that sweet simplicity peculiar to themselves, which is always pleasing to the beholder.

"In one of the tombs of the kings I found two wooden figures, nearly seven feet high, of very fine workmanship. They are in a standing posture, with one arm extended, as if holding a torch. They had many other carved works, hieroglyphics, ornaments, &c.

"The art of varnishing, and baking the varnish on clay, was in such perfection among them, that I doubt whether it could be imitated at present. Articles of the best sorts of this manufacture, however, were rather scarce, as there are but few to be found; while, on the contrary, there are great quantities of the inferior sorts. Indeed, the few good ones I met with were all in the great tomb of Samethis, and these are of the most beautiful colour.

"The art of painting was but simple among the Egyptians, as they had no knowledge of shadowing to elevate their figures; but great credit is due to them for their taste in disposing their colours. There is great harmony even in the red and green, which do not always agree with us, and which they knew how to mingle so well, that it produced a very splendid effect, particularly by candle-light. As I observed before, I am of opinion, that these colours were from the vegetable kingdom, and think I can produce a pretty strong proof of the fact. The present natives of Egypt, who manufacture indigo, make it up in cakes of the size of a sea biscuit, in a very rough manner. Not knowing how to extract the colour from the plant without mixing it with sand, the cake glitters all over, the light being reflected from every particle. Of this imperfection the ancient Egyptians could not get the better; for whenever there is blue in any of their paintings, which is evidently indigo, the same sparkling sand is to be seen, as in the modern cakes. Their drawings and sculpture are but simple, and systematically done; notwithstanding which, they knew how to impart a certain vivacity to their posture, which animates their figures. They knew little or nothing of perspective, and all that was done was in profile. The wall or whatever other place was to be ornamented was previously prepared, by grinding it very smooth. The first lines were done in red by a scholar, or one not so expert as the master, who examined the outlines, and corrected them in black. Specimens of this are to be seen in the tomb of Samethis, as I shall have to mention hereafter.

"When the outlines were completed, the sculptor began his work. He raised the figure by cutting away the stone all round it. The angles are smoothly turned, and the ornaments on the figure or garments are traced with a chisel, which leaves a slight impression, and adorns the whole figure. The last was the painter, who finished the piece. They could not find any other colours than red, blue, yellow, green, and black. The blue is divided into two sorts, the dark and the light. With these colours they adorned their temples, tombs, or whatever they wished to have painted. As there is no colour among these that could imitate the living human flesh, they adopted the red for this purpose. The ornaments were decorated with the other colours; and, though so few, I am sure they are not all used in the same piece." (P. 178—176.)

Their architecture is in unison with the ideas which were held by the ancient Egyptians. Entertaining the notion that they should return to life after a period of three thousand years, they seem to have designed their edifices to last so long, that they might behold them again in a good state of preservation. They evidently knew how to turn an arch; and though the science of architecture was brought to great perfection by the Greeks, yet these (Mr. Belzoni shews) were indebted to the Egyptians for their principal hints.

The wonderful sculptures of the Egyptians are justly admired for the boldness of their execution. Their enormous sizes rendered it difficult for the artists to maintain their due proportions, which, however, were in general well preserved. Thus, if a statue were erected as large as life, the head was of the natural size; if it were thirty feet high, the head was larger in proportion to the body; and, if fifty feet high, the magnitude of the head was further increased. These gigantic sculptures are executed in sand-stone, calcareous stone, breccia, or granite: the three last are extremely hard, and it is not now known with what tools they were wrought. Mr. Belzoni conjectures that they were originally less hard than they now are. The angles of the figures on the calcareous stone, in particular, are so sharp, that no modern chisels could produce the like; its fracture is more like that of glass than of stone and the granite is almost impenetrable.

While our traveller was exploring the recesses of the dead at Gournou, he took up his lodging with the troglodyte inhabitants, in the entrance of some of the tombs, not the most pleasant residence to one who had been accustomed to the comforts of civilized life in Europe.

During these interesting researches among the sepulchres of Gournou, his excavations were carried on at Carnac with equal success. At this place he uncovered a colossal head of red granite, of beautiful workmanship, and uncommonly well preserved, with the exception of one ear and part of the chin, which had been knocked off along with the beard. Though of larger proportion than that of the young Memnon, it is neither so bulky nor so heavy, having no part of the shoulder attached to it. The removal of it, however, occupied eight days, though the distance is little more than a mile. Besides this head, which is ten feet from the neck to the top of the mitre, Mr. Belzoni procured an arm belonging to the same colossus, and measuring also ten feet. This interesting relic of antiquity, together with others which by this time he had accumulated at Luxor, was sufficient to fill another boat as large as that which he had freighted in the preceding

year. But before he could send them down the Nile, he was compelled to suspend his researches in consequence of the intrigues of the French agents with the Defterdar Bey; and having surrounded the antiquities which he had thus collected with a mud wall, our author set out on the 24th of May for Assouan. Here he took a general view of Elephantine and the other islands, whence he proceeded to Philæ, and examined the magnificent ruins on that island, the style of which (he is of opinion) indicates that they were executed in the last era of the Egyptians, and probably in the time of the Ptolomies. During his residence on this island, Mr. Belzoni was joined by Captains Irby and Mangles; and on the 4th of June the party commemorated his late Majesty's birth-day by royal salutes, to the great terror of the natives in the vicinity, who could not conceive why they wasted so much powder to no purpose. Having at length received a supply of money from Mr. Salt, together with his permission to open the temple of Ybsambul, Belzoni and his party proceeded thither. After encountering various difficulties, which were interposed by the Cacheffs of the country, they succeeded in clearing away the sand, and on the first of August entered the finest and most extensive excavation in Nubia, with the exception perhaps of the tomb newly discovered in the valley of Beban'el Malook. It was a magnificent temple enriched with beautiful intaglios, paintings, and colossal figures. The travellers first entered into a pro-naos, or porch, fifty-seven feet long and fifty-two wide, supported by two rows of pillars, five feet and a half square, to each of which was attached a figure, the top of whose turban reached the ceiling, which was about thirty feet in height. Both these and the walls are covered with hieroglyphics, superior in point of execution to any other in Egypt, and exhibiting battles, the storming of castles, triumphs over the Ethiopians, sacrifices, &c.

"Some of the columns are much injured by the close and heated atmosphere, the temperature of which was so hot, that the thermometer must have risen to above a hundred and thirty degrees. The second hall is about twenty-two feet high, thirty-seven wide, and twenty-five and a half long. It contains four pillars about four feet square; and the walls of this also are covered with fine hieroglyphics in pretty good preservation. Beyond this is a shorter chamber, thirty-seven feet wide, in which is the entrance into the sanctuary. At each end of this chamber is a door, leading into smaller chambers in the same direction with the sanctuary, each eight feet by seven. The sanctuary is twenty-three feet and a half long, and twelve feet wide. It contains a pedestal in the centre, and at the end four colossal sitting figures, the heads of which are in good preservation, not having been injured by violence. On the right side of this great hall, entering into the temple, are two doors, at a short distance from each other, which

Belzoni's Discoveries in Egypt and Nubia.

lead into two long separate rooms, the first thirty-eight feet ten inches in length, and eleven feet five inches wide; the other forty-eight feet seven inches, by thirteen feet three. At the end of the first are several unfinished hieroglyphics, of which some, though merely sketched, give fine ideas of their manner of drawing. At the lateral corners of the entrance into the second chamber from the great hall is a door, each of which leads into a small chamber twenty-two feet six inches long, and ten feet wide. Each of these rooms has two doors leading into two other chambers, forty-three feet in length, and ten feet eleven inches wide. There are two benches in them, apparently to sit on. The most remarkable subjects in this temple are, 1st, a group of captive Ethiopians, in the western corner of the great hall: 2d, the hero killing a man with his spear, another lying slain under his feet, on the same western wall: 3d, the storming of a castle, in the western corner from the front door. The outside of this temple is magnificent. It is a hundred and seventeen feet wide, and eighty-six feet high; the height from the top of the cornice to the top of the door being sixty-six feet six inches, and the height of the door twenty feet. There are four enormous sitting colossi, the largest in Egypt or Nubia, except the great Sphinx at the pyramids, to which they approach in the proportion of near two-thirds. From the shoulder to the elbow they measure fifteen feet six inches; the ears three feet six inches; the face seven feet; the beard five feet six inches; across the shoulders twenty-five feet four inches; their height is about fifty-one feet, not including the caps, which are about fourteen feet. There are only two of these colossi in sight, one is still buried under the sand, and the other, which is near the door, is half fallen down, and buried also. On the top of the door is a colossal figure of Osiris twenty feet high, with two colossal hieroglyphic figures, one on each side, looking towards it. On the top of the temple is a cornice with hieroglyphics, a torus and frieze under it. The cornice is six feet wide, the frieze is four feet. Above the cornice is a row of sitting monkeys eight feet high, and six across the shoulders. They are twenty-one in number. This temple was nearly two-thirds buried under the sand, of which we removed thirty-one feet before we came to the upper part of the door. It must have had a very fine landing-place, which is now totally buried under the sand. It is the last and largest temple excavated in the solid rock in Nubia or Egypt, except the new tomb. It took twenty-two days to open it, beside six days last year. We sometimes had eighty men at work, and sometimes only our own personal exertions, the party consisting of Mr. Beechey, Captains Irby and Mangles, myself, two servants, and the crew, eleven in all, and three boys. It is situated under a rock about a hundred feet above the Nile, facing the south-east by east, and about one day and a half's journey from the second cataract in Nubia, or Wady Halfa.

The heat was so great in the interior of the temple, that it scarcely permitted us to take any drawings, as the perspiration from our hands soon rendered the paper quite wet. Accordingly, we left this operation to succeeding travellers, who may set about it with more convenience than we could, as the place will become cooler. Our stock of

provision was so reduced, that the only food we had for the last six days was dhourra, boiled in water without salt, of which we had none left. The Cacheffs had given orders to the people not to sell us any kind of food whatever, hoping that we might be driven away by hunger. But there was an Abady, who lived in the village, and as he was of a different tribe, he was not so much afraid of disobeying the Cacheffs. He sometimes came at night, and brought us milk; but he was at last detected, and prevented from bringing any more." (P. 212—214.)

Such is our author's account of this magnificent relic of Egyptian art: in the folio volume of plates, which accompanies his work, he has given an exterior view of the temple as seen at a distance, and also an interior view of it. To these engravings we must refer our readers, for an adequate idea of the gorgeous splendour of the subjects therein delineated. On the fourth of August they quitted this interesting spot and sailed down the Nile (the inundation of which was now at its height), to Thebes. Here he recommenced his excavations in the valley of Beban el Malook, and on the 16th of August he succeeded in penetrating into the tomb of Psammuthis, king of Egypt. Of this monument of Egyptian skill we have a long and minute description, which can scarcely be understood without referring to Mr. Belzoni's plates. We shall therefore notice only a few of the more remarkable representations, which may enable our readers to form some idea of this magnificent excavation.

The entrance into the tomb is at the foot of a high hill, with a pretty steep ascent. The first thing that presents itself to a traveller is a stair-case cut out of the rock, and descending to the tomb: this leads into an apartment covered with figures and hieroglyphics, which (as in all the other apartments but one) are sculptured in basso relievo, and painted over. As our traveller states this room to give the best ideas, that have yet been obtained, of the original process of Egyptian sculpture, we extract the following details concerning it:

"The wall was previously made as smooth as possible, and where there were flaws in the rocks, the vacuum was filled up with cement, which, when hard, was cut along with the rest of the rock. Where a figure or any thing else was required to be formed, after the whole was prepared, the sculptor appears to have made his first sketches of what was intended to be cut out. When the sketches were finished in red lines by the first artist, another more skilful corrected the errors, if any, and his lines were made in black, to be distinguished from those which were imperfect. When the figures were thus prepared, the sculptor proceeded to cut out the stone all round the figure, which remained in basso relievo, some to the height of half an inch, and some much less, according to the size of the figure. For instance, if a figure were as large as life, its elevation was generally half an inch; if the figure were not more than six inches in length, its projection would

not exceed the thickness of a dollar, or perhaps less. The angles of the figures were all smoothly rounded, which makes them appear less prominent than they really are. The parts of the stone that were to be taken off all round the figure did not extend much farther, as the wall is thickly covered with figures and hieroglyphics; and I believe there is not a space on those walls more than a foot square without some figure or hieroglyphic. The garments, and various parts of the limbs, were marked by a narrow line, not deeper than the thickness of a half-crown, but so exact, that it produced the intended effect.

When the figures were completed and made smooth by the sculptor, they received a coat of whitewash all over. This white is so beautiful and clear, that our best and whitest paper appeared yellowish when compared with it. The painter came next, and finished the figure. It would seem as if they were unacquainted with any colour to imitate the naked parts, since red is adopted as a standing colour for all that meant flesh. There are some exceptions indeed; for in certain instances, when they intended to represent a fair lady, by way of distinguishing her complexion from that of the men, they put on a yellow colour to represent her flesh; yet it cannot be supposed that they did not know how to reduce their red paints to a flesh colour, for on some occasions, where the red flesh is supposed to be seen through a thin veil, the tints are nearly of the natural colour, if we suppose the Egyptians to have been of the same hue as their successors, the present Copts, some of whom are nearly as fair as the Europeans. Their garments were generally white, and their ornaments formed the most difficult part, when the artists had to employ red in the distribution of the four colours, in which they were very successful. When the figures were finished, they appear to have laid on a coat of varnish; though it may be questioned whether the varnish were thus applied, or incorporated with the colour. The fact is, that nowhere else except in this tomb is the varnish to be observed, as no place in Egypt can boast of such preservation, nor can the true customs of the Egyptians be seen any where else with greater accuracy." (P. 238, 239.)

Quitting this apartment, after passing through several corridors or chambers, Mr. Belzoni entered a spacious saloon with an arched roof or ceiling, in the centre of which he discovered a sarcophagus of oriental alabaster, nine feet five inches long, by three feet seven inches in width, and only two inches thick. It is translucent when a light is placed in the inside of it; and is minutely sculptured, within and without, with several hundred figures, not exceeding two inches in height, and representing (as he conjectures) the funeral rites of the deceased, united with various emblems. The cover of this sarcophagus was not there; it had been taken out and broken into several pieces, which were found in digging before the first entrance. The other various apartments of this splendid relic of Egyptian art are nearly described by our traveller, whose account, with the aid of his beautiful engravings, will enable his readers

Belzoni's Discoveries in Egypt and Nubia.

to form a good idea of the magnificence and skill displayed in every part of this superb structure. Having embarked all that he had found this season, Mr. Belzoni quitted Thebes with another accumulation of antiquities, and arrived at Cairo, after ten months' absence.

He now directed his attention to the pyramids of Egypt, which he visited in company with two Europeans. The enormous size of these ancient monuments, and the solidity of their structure, seem to promise a duration almost coeval with the everlasting mountains. They are visible at a great distance, and, as the traveller advances, appear to retire within the desert. Their stupendous height, prodigious surface, and enormous solidity, strike the spectator with an involuntary awe, as they recall the memory of distant ages. The principal pyramids are situated in the vicinity of Thebes, at the entrance of the Plain of Mummies, where Mr. Belzoni made the very successful researches noticed in a preceding page, and where the sepulchres of the ancient Egyptians, hewn out of the solid rock, are closed with stones of a large size, and covered with sand. On the arrival of Mr. Belzoni and his companions at these monuments, while the latter entered the first pyramid, he took a turn round the second, or the pyramid of Cephrenes. The following is his account of the impressions produced on his mind by the contemplation of this wonderful monument:

“ I seated myself in the shade of one of those stones on the east side, which form the part of the temple that stood before the pyramid in that direction. My eyes were fixed on that enormous mass, which for so many ages had baffled the conjectures of ancient and modern writers. Herodotus himself was deceived by the Egyptian priests, when told there were no chambers in it. The sight of the wonderful work before me astonished me as much, as the total obscurity in which we are of its origin, its interior, and its construction. In an intelligent age like the present, one of the greatest wonders of the world stood before us, without our knowing ever whether it had any cavity in the interior, or if it were only one solid mass. The various attempts which have been made by numerous travellers to find an entrance into this pyramid, and particularly by the great body of French savans, were examples so weighty, that it seemed little short of madness, to think of renewing the enterprise.” (P. 255.)

Undeterred, however, by the successive failures of others, Belzoni resolved to attempt an entrance into this celebrated pyramid, which his experience in such researches induced him to think practicable. Accordingly he returned to Cairo, and having obtained a firman from the Kakia Bey, he announced that he was going on an expedition to the mountain of Mokattam for a few days, and crossed the Nile to the scene of operation.

His first attempts were unsuccessful; but, making accurate comparative observations on the first pyramid, he applied them to that which he was desirous of exploring: and after various labours, which are narrated in a very simple and interesting manner, he found himself in the centre of that pyramid, which, from time immemorial, had been the subject of the obscure conjectures of travellers and antiquaries. The chamber in which he now was, is computed to be forty-six feet three inches long, by sixteen feet three inches in width, and twenty-three feet six inches high. It is excavated out of the solid rock, from the floor to the roof, which, being composed of large blocks of calcareous stone, meeting in the centre, is of the same slope as the pyramid itself. The ceiling is painted; and, after some search, he found a sarcophagus of the finest granite: the cover had been broken at the side, so that it was half open; but, like the sarcophagus in the first pyramid (that of Cheops), it is destitute of hieroglyphics. Many of the stones in this apartment had been removed from their places, evidently by some one in quest of treasure; and this observation of our author was subsequently confirmed by his discovering an Arabic inscription at the west end of the apartment, purporting that the pyramid had been opened in the presence of one of the early Mohammedan sovereigns, and again carefully closed up.

Few subjects have occasioned more speculation than the intent and use of the Egyptian pyramids. About thirty years since, a German professor published a volume to prove that these majestic remains of the most remote antiquity are nothing more than basaltic eruptions, magnificent sports of Nature, and so many incontrovertible proofs of the general derangement which has taken place on the globe! The improbability and absurdity of this hypothesis, however, are sufficiently demonstrated by the vestiges of human skill and labour which are evident in the pyramids. The great appearance of antiquity which they manifestly display, favours the supposition, that they must have been constructed at an earlier period than any other edifices that are to be seen in Egypt. Homer is silent respecting them; but his silence is no proof that they were not in existence in his time. It should seem that, in the time of Herodotus, as little was known concerning the second pyramid as before the late opening, with this exception, that in his time the second pyramid was nearly in the state in which it was left when closed by the builders.

Respecting these stupendous edifices, the common opinion (grounded on the authority of the Greek writers from a very remote antiquity) has been, and still is, that they were erected as the tombs of certain very ancient sovereigns of Egypt, and

ascribed to the three kings Cheops, Cephrenes, and Mycerinus. From the discovery of a fragment of a bull's bone, however, in the pyramid of Cephrenes, Mr. Faber (in his ingenious "Remarks" on that pyramid) endeavours to prove that each of the celebrated pyramids of Egypt was a mystic tomb, or high place, of that Osiris who was annually bewailed as dead, and was worshipped under the form of a bull; and consequently that these gigantic structures were *not* literal tombs of certain ancient sovereigns of the country. From their coincidence, in point of form, with the Babylonian pyramid (or Tower of Babel), he considers them as imitations of Mount Ararat, where the ark first rested, and as relics of the first and most ancient superstition which prevailed after the flood. The examination of this hypothesis, the grounds of which are stated at full length in his elaborate work on the "Origin of Pagan Idolatry," we have neither time nor space to prosecute: the praise of ingenuity it is impossible to withhold from it; but we apprehend that the current of popular opinion will continue to set in favour of the tradition related by Herodotus, viz. that the Egyptian pyramids were really the sepulchres of the sovereigns whose names they have borne for so many ages; especially when it is considered that they are surrounded by other smaller pyramids intermixed with mausoleums or burial-grounds, and that many mummy pits have been found in their immediate vicinity.

Disappointed in his plan of making further researches at Thebes, where his former excavations had been so successful, by the ground being pre-occupied by the agents of Mr. Drouetti and of Mr. Salt, Belzoni determined to make a journey to the Red Sea, and explore the ruins of the ancient city of Berenice, which part was *said* to have been visited by M. Caliad, whom the Bashaw had commissioned to examine some sulphur and emerald mines, the existence of which had been reported to him. The exaggerated accounts of this person are corrected by our traveller, who was fortunate enough to reach the emerald mines, and also to discover the real site of Berenice. In this excursion Belzoni and Mr. Beechey, who accompanied him, witnessed one of the greatest calamities which had occurred in Egypt in the recollection of any person living. The Nile rose this season three feet and a half above the highest mark left by the former inundation, with uncommon rapidity, and carried off many villages, besides several hundreds of their inhabitants. Though the Arabs had expected an extraordinary inundation this year, in consequence of the scarcity of water in the preceding season, its height far exceeded their expectations or apprehensions. They generally erect fences of reeds and earth around their villages, to keep off the water from their dwellings; but the

force of this inundation baffled all their efforts. Their earth-constructed cottages could not resist the current for an instant: men, women, children, cattle, corn,—every thing was suddenly washed away, and not a vestige of the village left. In one of his plates, Mr. Belzoni has given a view of the desolation caused by this tremendous deluge in the valley of the Nile; from which, by allowing the use of his boat, he was the providential instrument of rescuing a great number of men and women, together with their corn and cattle, and conveying them to higher ground. In traversing the deserts from the Nile to the Red Sea, he passed through the tract occupied by the Ababde Arabs, of whose savage customs he has related some interesting particulars; and at length he reached the far-famed emerald mines, of which he has given an account.

Having procured a guide to conduct them to the ruins of Berenice, Mr. Belzoni and his companions prosecuted a long and fruitless journey in quest of that city; the result of which disposed them then to think that no such place ever existed, and that M. Caliad had seen the great city only in his own imagination. They then advanced through a dreary region, until they reached the Red Sea, which they coasted for several days, and at length unexpectedly arrived at some ruins, which Mr. Belzoni conjectured to be those of Berenice, though they do not exactly correspond with the situation laid down by D'Anville. According to Strabo, this city was erected by Ptolemy Philadelphus. Situated in a lower part of the Arabian Gulph, it facilitated navigation by enabling mariners to take advantage of the regular winds. The inland route between Coptos and Berenice, was opened with an army by the same prince, who established stations along it for the protection of travellers. His commercial plans were adopted by his son Ptolemy Evergetes. The importance of their arrangements was perceived by the Romans, on their conquest of Egypt; and they made it the emporium of their eastern trade.

Mr. Belzoni's account of the ruins of Berenice, (which are delineated in two engravings) is as follows:

“To our agreeable surprise, we found ourselves all at once on one of those mounds of ruins which show the spot of ancient towns, so often seen in Egypt. We entered, and at once we saw the regular situations of the houses; the main streets, their construction, and in the centre, a small Egyptian temple, nearly covered by the sand, as well as the insides of the houses; and our wonder increased on examining the materials with which the houses were built. We could see nothing but coral, roots, madrepore, and several petrifications of sea-weeds, &c.

The temple is built of a kind of soft, calcareous, and sandy stone, but decayed much by the air of the sea. The situation of this town is beautiful. The open sea before it is on the east, and from the southern coast to the point of the cape is like an amphitheatre of mountains,

except an opening on the north-west plain, where we came from. The Cape el Galahen extends its point nearly opposite the town on the east, and forms a shelter for large ships from the north and north-west winds. Right opposite the town there is a very fine harbour entirely made by nature; its entrance is on the north, it is guarded on the east by a neck of incrustated rock, on the south by the land, and on the west by the town; the north side, as I said before, being covered by the range of mountains which forms the cape, protects the harbour also. Its entrance has been deep enough for small vessels, such as the ancients had at those times, but no doubt was deeper. It has at present a bar of sand across, so that nothing could enter at low water; but a passage could be easily cut, and the harbour rendered useful." (P. 330, 331.)

The temple above noticed, on being partly uncovered, proved to be Egyptian; and on the wall were some well executed sculptures in basso relievo, as also some hieroglyphics. The plain surrounding this town is very extensive, and inclined to vegetation, such as a sandy soil can produce: and at a small distance the travellers saw several groups of ruins which Mr. Belzoni thinks were houses situated out of the town in different directions. From the calculation which he made, he supposes that its population may have amounted to ten thousand persons. Having ascertained that no other Berenice is in existence, corresponding to that laid down in D'Anville's map, the travellers returned to Gournou, after an arduous journey of forty days.

Mr. Belzoni's next achievement was to embark, and send down the cataracts of the Nile, an obelisk, which he had discovered on the island of Philæ: this was not accomplished without considerable difficulty, notwithstanding his hydraulic skill. His last excursion was to the Oasis El Cassar in Faioum, which is so rich in antiquities as to afford some ground that it is the far-famed Oasis of Jupiter Ammon. For his adventures in this expedition, as well as his account of the natural and artificial objects which he beheld, we must refer our readers to his simple, but very interesting narrative, in which are interspersed many characteristic anecdotes of the rude inhabitants whom he met.

Exclusively occupied with researches after antiquities, Mr. Belzoni has added comparatively little to our stores of natural history: his pages, however, are enriched with many striking particulars relative to the manners and customs of the Egyptians, Nubians, and different Arab tribes with whom he had any intercourse.

With so many advantages as Mr. Belzoni enjoyed of elucidating various passages of Holy Writ, we confess that we have been struck with his total want of allusion to the Sacred Scriptures. We have, however, noticed two or three passages which derive material illustration from some of his remarks concerning the natural phenomena of Egypt, and with them we shall conclude our analysis of his work.

The first phenomenon we shall notice is, the *whirlwind*. It is well known that what are, in the Old Testament, termed the *latter rains*, fall towards the middle, and sometimes towards the close of *April*, that is, a short time before the Jews gathered in their harvest. These rains were often preceded by whirlwinds*, which raised such quantities of sand as to darken the sky, or in the words of the sacred historian, to make the '*heaven black with clouds and wind*†; and as these whirlwinds were sometimes fatal to travellers, who were overwhelmed by them in the deserts, the rapidity of their advance is elegantly employed by Solomon, to show both the certainty and the suddenness of that destruction which will befall the finally and impenitently wicked‡. The passages of holy writ here referred to, derive considerable elucidation from the following account of the whirlwinds of the great Egyptian desert. These winds occur all the year round; but especially during the blowing of the camseen wind, which commences in April, and continues fifty days§.

"It generally blows from the south-west, and lasts four, five, or six days without varying, so very strong, that it raises the sands to a great height, forming a general cloud, so thick that it is impossible to keep the eyes open, if not under cover. It is troublesome even to the Arabs; it forces the sand into the houses through every cranny, and fills every thing with it. The caravans cannot proceed in the deserts; the boats cannot continue their voyages; and travellers are obliged to eat sand in spite of their teeth. The whole is like a chaos. Often a quantity of sand and small stones gradually ascends to a great height and forms a column sixty or seventy feet in diameter, and so thick, that were it steady on one spot; it would appear a solid mass. This not only revolves within its own circumference, but runs in a circular direction over a great space of ground, sometimes maintaining itself in motion for half an hour, and where it falls it accumulates a small hill of sand. God help the poor traveller who is caught under it!" (P. 195, 196.)

The next phenomenon is the *mirage*, which is termed by the Arabs, as well as by the Hebrew prophet שָׁרָב (*serab*): it is that false appearance which in Eastern countries is often seen in sandy plains about noon, resembling a large lake in motion, and which is occasioned by the reverberation of the sun-beams. On a nearer approach, however, the thirsty traveller perceives the deception. To this phenomenon the prophet Isaiah alludes; when, predicting the blessings of Messiah's kingdom, he says, "*the glowing sand shall become a pool, and the thirsty land bubbling springs*"

* See 2 Kings, iii. 16, 17.

† 1 Kings, viii. 45.

‡ Prov. i. 27.

§ Hence the name *camseen*, which in Arabic signifies fifty.

|| Isaiah, ch. xxxv. 7. Bp. Lowth's Translation.

The mirage has often been described by oriental travellers, and their narratives are thus confirmed by Mr. Belzoni, who acknowledges that he has himself been deceived by it, even after he was aware of its nature.

"The perfect resemblance to water, and the strong desire for this element, made me conclude, in spite of all my caution not to be deceived, that it was really water I saw. It generally appears like a still lake, so unmoved by the wind, that every thing above is to be seen most distinctly reflected by it, which is the principal cause of the deception. If the wind agitate any of the plants that rise above the horizon of the mirage, the motion is seen perfectly, at a great distance. If the traveller stand elevated much above the mirage, the apparent water seems less united and less deep, for, as the eyes look down upon it, there is not thickness enough in the vapour on the surface of the ground to conceal the earth from the sight. But, if the traveller be on a level with the horizon of the mirage, he cannot see through it, so that it appears to him clear water. By putting my head first to the ground, and then mounting a camel, the height of which from the ground might have been about ten feet at the most, I found a great difference in the appearance of the mirage. On approaching it, it becomes thinner, and appears as if agitated by the wind, like a field of ripe corn. It gradually vanishes as the traveller approaches, and at last entirely disappears when he is on the spot." (P. 196.)

The third phenomenon is the *locusts*, whose depredations are described in vivid colours by various travellers in the east. Their accounts are thus corroborated.

"These animals I have seen in such clouds, that twice the number in the same space would form an opaque mass, which would wholly intercept the rays of the sun, and cause complete darkness. They alight on fields of corn, or other vegetables, and in a few minutes devour their whole produce. The natives make a great noise to frighten them away, but in vain; and, by way of retaliation, they catch and eat them when fried, considering them a dainty repast. They are something like the grasshopper in form, about two inches in length. They are generally of a yellow or gold colour, but there are some red and some green." (P. 197.)

In this short extract, two passages of the Scriptures are illustrated, viz. 1. The first chapter of the prophecy of Joel, which in its primary sense refers to the desolation that was to be caused by these insects in the land of Judah; and 2. The gospel of Saint Mark, (ch. i 6.) where it is said that John the Baptist *did eat locusts in the wilderness*.

The account of the invasion of Judea, by Pharaoh-Necho, king of Egypt, related in 2 Kings, xxiii. 29—34. (which was provoked by Josiah) is confirmed by the sculptures discovered by Mr. Belzoni in the tomb of his son Psammethis. Necho conquered Jerusalem and Babylon, and Psammethis made war against the Ethiopians. In one of the halls of this tomb is a mili-

ary procession, consisting of a great number of figures, all looking towards a man who is greatly superior to them in size, and who faces them. At the end of this procession (which is given in three of the accompanying plates) are three different sorts of people, of other nations, evidently Jews, Ethiopians, and Persians. The Jews are clearly distinguished by their physiognomy, and complexion; the Ethiopians, by their colour and ornaments; and the Persians, by their well known dress, as they are so often seen in the pictures of their battles with the Egyptians, discovered in the tombs explored by Mr. Belzoni. Behind the Persians are some Egyptians without their ornaments, as if they were rescued captives returning to their country. Among the hieroglyphics, contained in his drawings of this tomb, Dr. Young (who is pre-eminently distinguished for his successful researches in archæology) has discovered the names of Nichas (Necho) and Psammethis.

The extent to which our article has reached, admonishes us to close our analysis of Mr. Belzoni's interesting volume, whose simplicity of narrative and perspicuity of description, aided by forty-four well-executed lithographic engravings, have rendered his work so highly and deservedly popular, that while we are writing, a second edition is announced.

NEW BOOKS

PUBLISHED FROM DECEMBER, 1820, TO FEBRUARY, 1821.

ANTIQUITIES, ARCHITECTURE, SCIENCES, AND FINE ARTS.

PLANS, Elevations, Sections, &c. of the Pauper Lunatic Asylum, lately erected at Wakefield. By Watson and Pritchett, of York, med. folio, 2*l*. 12*s*. 6*d*. royal folio, 3*l*. 3*s*.

Observations on the Construction and Fitting up of Meeting Houses for Public Worship, with Plans, &c.; including one lately erected in the City of York. By William Alexander, 4*to*. 9*s*.

Views in Ceylon, a Series of Six Engravings, highly finished in Colours, illustrative of Candyen Scenery, Costume, &c. 5*l*. 5*s*.

A History of Northumberland, in Three Parts. By the Rev. John Hodgson, Secretary to the Newcastle AS. Vol. V. being the First Volume of Part III; and containing an exact Record and Historical Papers. 4*to*. demy, 2*l*. 2*s*. Royal Paper 3*l*. 3*s*.

Memoirs of a Goldfinch, a Poem, principally on the Motion of the heavenly Bodies, in Answer to Mr. Friend. 2*s*. 6*d*. half-bound.

The Grecian, Roman, and Gothic Architecture, considered as applicable to public and private Buildings in this Country. By William Fox. 5*s*. boards.

A Picturesque Tour of the Seine, from Paris to the Sea. Plates highly coloured, No. I. Elephant 4*to*. 14*s*.—or, 1*l*. 1*s*. large paper—to be completed in Six Monthly Parts.

A Series of Designs for private Dwellings. By J. Hedgeland. Part I. 4*to*. 1*l*. 1*s*. boards.

Twelve Plates of Birds, designed for the use of the Artist, the Connoisseur, and the Naturalist. Demy folio. 5*s*.

BIOGRAPHY.

Memoirs of the Life of Nicholas Poussin. By Maria Graham, 8*vo*. Portrait, 10*s*. 6*d*.

The Life of the late George Hill, DD. By George Cook, DD. 8*vo*. With a Portrait. 10*s*. 6*d*.

The Annual Biography and Obituary of celebrated Men, for 1821. 8*vo*. 15*s*.

The Life of Voltaire, with interesting Particulars respecting his Death. By F. H. Standish, Esq. 8*vo*. 12*s*.

Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Victor Alfieri. 12*mo*. with a Portrait. 5*s*. 6*d*. boards.

Memoir of Mrs. Dyott, under the solemn Form of an Oath, written by herself, accounting for her Separation from General Dyott. 8*vo*. 2*s*.

EDUCATION, SCHOOL BOOKS, AND CLASSIC AUTHORS.

The Scientific Monitor; or, Sequel to the Scholars' Remembrancer. By M. Seaman, 12*mo*. 2*s*. 6*d*. half-bound.

Selections of Classic Italian Poetry from the Works of Tasso, Ariosto, &c. for the Use of Students in the Italian Language. By T. B. Defferrari. 2 vols. 12*mo*. 12*s*. boards.

Conversations on English Grammar, in a Series of Familiar and Entertaining Dialogues between a Mother and her Daughter. By Mrs. Williams. 12*mo*. half-bound.

Germs of Thought ; or, Rudiments of Knowledge ; intended to Promote the Mental, and Religious Improvement of Youth. By Thomas Wood. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

A Clue for Young Latinists, and Non-Latinists, to trace the Origin, &c. of Nouns and Verbs. By John Carey. LL.D. 12mo. 2s. bound.

A Grammar of Universal Geography, and of Elementary Astronomy. By Alexander Jamieson. 18mo. 3s. 6d. bound.

M. Tullii Ciceronis Opera. Ex Editionibus Oliveti et Ernesti sedula recensione accurata Johannis Carey, LL.D. Correctly printed, in 12 Pocket Volumes. 3l. 12s. boards.

Key to the Second and Third Parts of Ellis's Exercises, from the Writings of Cicero, with References to the Passages in the Original. 12mo. 3s. bound.

HISTORY.

The History of the Rebellion in 1745 and 1746, with Portraits of both the Pretenders. By the Chevalier de Johnstone. Translated from the French MS. 4to. 2l. 2s.

A View of the History, Literature, and Religion of the Hindoos : including a Minute Description of their Manners and Customs. By the Rev. W. Ward. vols. III. and IV. 1l. 2s.

Pictures, Historical and Biographical, drawn from English, Scottish, and Irish History. By John Galt, Esq. 2 vols. foolscap. 14s.

A Narrative of Proceedings in Venezuela, in South America, in 1819 and 1820 ; with Observations on the Country and People—on its Republican Government, and Leading Members. By G. L. Chesterton, 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Historical Memoirs of the City of Armagh, for a Period of 1373 years ; comprising a considerable Portion of the General History of Ireland, and a Refutation of the Opinions of Dr. Ledwich respecting the Non-existence of St. Patrick. By James Stuart, AB. 8vo. with plates. 18s. boards.

Historic Prologues ; or, Characters and Events, from the Conquest to the Death of Geo. III. By the Rev. John Davis, MA. 8vo. 5s. boards.

An Historical and Critical Account of a Grand Series of National Medals, published under the Direction of James Mudie, Esq. 4to. with plates, 1l. 11s. 6d.

LAW.

Essay on the Principles of Evidence, and their Application to Subjects of Judicial Inquiry. By James Glassford. 8vo. 18s. boards.

History of the Juridical System of Bengal. Royal 8vo. 8s. 6d.

A Report of the Case of Bills of Exchange, made payable at Bankers, as decided in the House of Lords ; with an Appendix. By Richard Bligh, Esq. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Howell's State Trials. Vol. 29 ; or, 8th of the Continuation. Royal 8vo. 1l. 11s. 6d. boards.

The Exclusion of the Queen from the Liturgy, historically and legally considered. By a Barrister. 8vo. 2s.

The Prerogatives of the Queen Consort of England. 2s.

An Analytical Digest of the Reports of Cases decided in the Courts of Common Law and Equity of Appeal and Nisi Prius, in the Year 1820. By Henry Jeremy, Esq. Royal 8vo. 9s.

A Treatise on the Law relative to Sales of Personal Property. By George Long, Esq. Barrister at Law. Royal 8vo. 43s. boards.

MEDICINE, SURGERY, AND PHYSIOLOGY.

A System of Chemistry, in four vols. 8vo. By Thomas Thomson, MD. Regius Professor of Chemistry in the University of Glasgow, &c. &c. Sixth Edition revised and corrected throughout. 3l. boards.

A Dissertation on the Treatment of Morbid Local Affections of the Nerves. By Joseph Swan. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

An Essay on the Diagnosis, between *Irysipelas*, *Phlegmon*, and *Erythema*. By George Hume Weatherhead, MD. 8vo. 4s.

The Pharmacopeia of the Royal College of Physicians of London, 1809, literally translated. By George Frederic Collier, Surgeon. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Elements of Chemistry, with its Application, to explain the Phenomena of Nature, &c. By James Millar, MD. 8vo. 12s.

Sound Mind, or, Contributions to the Natural History and Physiology of the Human Intellect. By J. Haslam. 8vo. 7s.

Practical Treatise on the Diseases of the Eye. By John Vetch, MD. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

An Inquiry into the Nature and Treatment of Gravel, Calculus, and other Diseases connected with a deranged Operation of the Urinary Organs. By William Prout, MD. FRS. 8vo. 7s. 6d. boards.

An Essay on Sea Bathing; in preserving Health; and as a remedy in Disease; especially Nervous, Scrophulous, &c. By J. W. Williams, Member of the College of Surgeons, London. 12mo. 5s. 6d.

Cases illustrating the improved Treatment of Stricture in the Urethra and Rectum. By James Arnott. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

A Dictionary of Chemistry, on the Basis of Mr. Nicholson's; in which the Principles of the Science are investigated anew. By Andrew Ure, MD. 8vo. 1l. 1s. boards.

Practical Observations in Midwifery; with a Selection of Cases. By John Ramsbotham, MD. 8vo. Part. I. 10s. 6d.

Practical Observations on Chronic Affection of the Digestive Organs, and on Bilious and Nervous Disorders. By John Thomas, MD. 8vo. 6s.

Illustrations of the great Operations of Surgery. By Charles Bell. Part I. Plates coloured. 1l. 1s.

Peptic Precepts: pointing out Methods to prevent and relieve Indigestion, and to regulate and invigorate the Action of the Stomach and Bowels. 12mo. 3s. boards.

History and Method of Cure of the various Species of Palsy. By John Cooke, MD. 8vo. 6s. boards.

MISCELLANEOUS.

A Treatise on Mildew, and the Cultivation of Wheat; including many Agricultural Hints. By Francis Blaikie. 1s. 6d.

A Description of a New Agricultural Implement, which, by the Power of One Horse, performs a Variety of Operations in Cultivation, at the rate of Three Acres per Day. By Major-Gen. Alex. Beatson. 8vo.

Observations on the Political, Moral, and Religious State of the Civilized World, in the beginning of the Nineteenth Century. By H. G. McNab, MD. 2s. 6d.

History of the Causes and Effects of the Confederation of the Rhine, translated from the Italian of Marquess Luchessini. By J. D. Dwyer. 8vo. 12s.

The Trial of the Queen, with numerous Portraits. 2 vols. 8vo. 14s.

The Botanical Cultivator; or, Instructions for the Management of Plants cultivated in the Hot Houses of Great Britain. By R. Sweet, FLS. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The Authentic and Intelligible Almanack; or, Annual Abstract of Celestial Lore, calculated from the Era of Human Redemption, for 1821. From the MS. of Sir Willon Lilly Brachm, KTR. Humanist. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Grisenthwaite's New Theory of Agriculture, in which the Nature of Soils, &c. is explained. By J. C. Curwen, Esq., MP. 8vo. 5s.

View of the Intellectual Powers of Man, with Observations on their Cultivation, adapted to the Present State of this Country. 8vo. 5s.

History of the several Italian Schools of Painting; with Observations. By J. T. James, MA. 8vo. 9s. 6d.

A few plain Directions for Persons intending to proceed as Settlers to his Majesty's Province of Upper Canada, in North America; containing also a short Sketch of the Author's Voyage across the Atlantic, in June, 1819. By an English Farmer, settled in Upper Canada. 12mo. With a Map. 3s. 6d. bds.

Italy, and the Italians in the 19th Century. With an Appendix. By a foreign Officer in the British Service. 1 vol. 8vo.

A Treatise on Chess; founded on a Plan of progressive Improvement. By the late J. H. Sarrat, Esq. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 10s.

Miraculous Prophecies and Predictions of eminent Men, particularly in England and France. 18mo. 5s. boards.

Universal Science; or the Cabinet of Nature and Art: comprising various Selections from useful Discoveries in the Arts and Sciences. By Alex. Jamieson. 2 vols. 12mo. 16s.

Constantine and Eugene; or, an Evening at Mount Vernon. 8vo. 3s.

A Defence of Mr. Brougham's Bill on Free Grammar Schools. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

A Catalogue of the Library of the Royal Institution. By the late Rev. Charles Burney, DD. arranged with an Alphabetical Index of Authors. By William Harris, Keeper of the Library. Royal 8vo. considerably enlarged, 1l. 1s.

Nuptiæ Sacræ; or, an Inquiry into the Scriptural Doctrine of Marriage and Divorce. 8vo. 5s. 6d.

The Cadet's Guide to India. By a Lieutenant of the Bengal Establishment. 2s. 6d.

Histoire de la Secte des Amis, suivie d'une Notice sur Madame Fry, et la Prison de Newgate. Par Madame Adèle du Thou. 12mo. 5s. boards.

The Scrap Book: containing a Collection of Amusing and Striking Pieces in Prose and Verse. By John M'Diarmid. 12mo. 7s. 6d. boards.

A concise Account of the Origin and Principles of the new Class of 24-Pounder Medium Guns, of Reduced Length and Weight, proposed in 1813, by Sir William Congreve, Bart. and adopted into his Majesty's Service. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

NOVELS, DRAMA, &c.

A Wild Goose Chase, a Farce. By H. Jameson, Esq. 2s.

Wallace, a Tragedy. By C. E. Walker, Esq. 2s.

John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough, an Historical Play in Five Acts. 2s.

Mary de Courtenay, a Novel, from the French of the Countess D***. 12mo. 5s. 6d.

The Earthquake, a Tale. By the Author of the Ayrshire Legatees. 3 vols. 12mo. 1l. 1s.

The Only Child, or Portia Bellenden. 7s. 6d. boards.

Anston Park, a Tale. 12mo. 6s.

The Lady and the Devil, a Musical Drama. By William Dimond, Esq. 2s.

Eleanor, or the Spectre of St. Michael's, a Novel. By Miss C. D. Haynes. 3 vols. 1l. 7s. 6d.

Feuds of Luna Perolli. 4 vols. 1l. 2s.

Society and Solitude. By Innes Hoole, Esq. 3 vols. 15s.

Calthorpe, or Fallen Fortunes. 3 vols. 1l. 1s.

Kenilworth. By the Author of "Waverley," &c. &c. 3 vols. 1l. 11s. 6d.

Mirandola; a Tragedy. By Barry Cornwall. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Traits and Trials. 2 vols. 14s.

Such is the world. 3 vols. 1l. 1s.

Scheming. 3 vols. 1l. 1s.

Falmyre et Flaminie, ou le Secret. 2 vols. 12s.

The Fair Witch of Glaslyn; a Romance. 3 vols. 1l. 4s.

Zelica, the Creole; or, Death of Christophe. 3 vols.

Mary de Courtenay, a Novel, from the French; with a Preface. By Miss Langer. 12mo. 5s. 6d.

The Republican Mistress, a Novel, founded upon facts. By Charlot. Smith. 3 vols. 18s.
 These, the Orphan of Geneva. 1s. 6d.

POETRY.

Poems. By Bernard Barton. Second Edition, with Additions. Foolscap. 7s.
 Poems; containing the Indian and Lazarus. Foolscap. 8vo. 3s. 6d. boards.
 The Harp of the Desert: containing the Battle of Algiers; with other Pieces.
 By Ishmael Fitz-Adam. 6s. 6d.
 The Luckless Drave; and other Poems; with Anecdotes of the Witches of East Lothian. 2s. 6d.
 The Outlaw of Taurus; a Poem; to which are added, Scenes from Sophocles:
 By T. Dale, of Cambridge. 8vo. 5s. 6d.
 Hofer; and other Poems. By Charles Edwards. 12mo. 4s.
 Echoism; a Poem. 12mo. 7s.
 Poems. By Thomas Gent. Foolscap 8vo. 5s.
 Odes and other Poems. By Henry Neele. Foolscap 8vo. 7s.
 The Monarchy of the Bees; a Poem; with Notes. 18mo. 2s. 6d.
 Amaranthus the Nympholept; with other Poems. Foolscap 8vo. 7s. 6d.
 Desultory Thoughts in London; Titus and Gisippus; with other Poems.
 By Charles Lloyd. 12mo. 7s. 6d.
 Picturesque Piety, illustrated by 48 Engravings, and an Original Poem to each. By the Rev. Isaac Taylor. 2 vols. 6s.
 Æsop in Rhyme, with some Originals. By Jeffreys Taylor. With 72 Plates. 12mo. 1s. neatly half-bound.
 What is Life? and other Poems. By Thomas Bailey. 18mo. 3s. 6d. boards.
 Specimens of the Russian Poets, with Remarks and Biographical Notices.
 Translated by John Bowring, FLS. 12mo. 8s. boards.

POLITICS AND POLITICAL ECONOMY.

Selections from the Queen's Answers to various Addresses presented to her. With an Introduction. 8vo. 2s. 6d.
 A letter to the Hon. and Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Gloucester, on the Subject of the Queen. By Paul Hartford. Esq. 8vo. 3s.
 Observations on the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords, relative to the Timber Trade. By a British Merchant. 8vo. 2s. 6d.
 A View of the Circulating Medium of the Bank of England, from its Incorporation to the present Time. 2s.
 Mirror; presented to his Sicilian Majesty, and the Allied Sovereigns—reflecting Political Facts hitherto unpublished. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
 Conversations on Political Economy; in a Series of Dialogues, with Remarks on our present Distresses, &c. By Joseph Pinsent. 8vo. 3s. 6d.
 Thoughts on the Criminal Prisons of this Country, occasioned by the Bill for consolidating and amending the Laws relating to Prisons. By George Holford, Esq. MP. 8vo. 2s.
 A Letter from an Englishman at St. Omer's to a Member of Parliament. 2s. 6d.

THEOLOGY.

Discourses on the Application of Christianity to the Commercial and Ordinary Affairs of Life. By Thomas Chalmers, DD. 8vo. 8s. boards.
 Letters to a Young Clergyman. By Stephenson McGill, DD. 5s. boards.
 Scripture Testimony to the Messiah. By J. Pye Smith, DD. Vols. II. and III. 8vo. 1l.
 On Evil: an Assize Sermon: preached March 23, 1820, at Kingston upon Thames. By the Rev. L. W. Elliot, A.M. 1s. 6d.
 On a Future Judgment: an Assize Sermon: preached August 3d, 1820, at the Holy Trinity Church, Guildford, Surrey. By the same Author. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

The Church and the Clergy; exhibiting the Obligations of Society, &c. By G. E. Shuttleworth, 8vo. 8s.

Eight Sermons, preached before the University of Oxford, in 1820, at the Hampton Lecture. By Godfrey Fausset, MA. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

First Lessons for Morning and Evening Service. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Reflections on Mr. Wall's History of Infant Baptism. By John Gale. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Hebrew Psalter of Vanderhooght. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

Sermons. By the late Rev Joseph Bretland; with his Life prefixed. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l.

A Sermon, preached in the Parish Church of High Wycombe, Bucks, Dec. 3, 1820. By the Rev. Thomas Boys, AM. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Hulsean Lectures for 1820. Twenty Discourses preached before the University of Cambridge in 1820, at the Lecture founded by the Rev. John Hulse. By the Rev. C. Benson, MA. 8vo. 12s. boards.

Tracts on the Divinity of Christ, and on the Repeal of the Statute against Blasphemy. By the Bishop of St. David's. 8vo. 12s. boards.

The Scripture Testimonies to the Divinity of Jesus Christ, collected and illustrated. By the Rev. G. Holden, MA. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The Liturgy of the Church of England Explained, her Worship and Doctrines Recommended and Vindicated. By Henry Jenkins. 12mo. 5s. boards.

Vindiciae Hebraicae; or, a Defence of the Hebrew Scriptures, occasioned by the Innovations, &c. of Mr. J. Bellamy. By Hyman Hurwitz. 8vo. 9s.

Two Sermons on Loyalty and the Christian Faith and Practice. By the Rev. Richard Pearson, BA. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Thirty-six Evening Prayers, as used in her own Family. By a Lady, 4to. 5s.

A Sermon preached in the Chapel at Lambeth, Nov. 12, 1820, at the Consecration of the Right Rev. Wm. Carey, DD. Lord Bishop of Exeter. By the Rev. E. Goodenough, DD. 4to. 2s.

The Book of Common Prayer, in Eight Languages, most Elegantly and Curiously printed, in 4to. 2l. 10s. boards.

The Infant's Progress from the Valley of Destruction to Everlasting Glory. By Mrs. Sherwood. 12mo. 5s. boards.

The Christian and Civic Economy of large Towns, Nos. 5th and 6th, "On Church Patronage." By Thomas Chalmers, DD. 8vo. price 2s. Published Quarterly, price 1s. each Number.

VOYAGES, TRAVELS, AND TOPOGRAPHY.

Classical Excursion from Rome to Arpino, comprising Dissertations on the Political Conduct observed by Cicero on his Villas and Monuments. By Charles Kelsall. 12s.

Illyria and Dalmatia; being a Description of the Manners, Customs, &c. of their Inhabitants. 2 vols. 12mo. with Engravings. 12s.

A Treatise on Topography, in which the Science and Practical Detail of Trigonometrical Surveying are explained, &c. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 6s.

A Narrative of a Journey to New Britain, a Country in the vast Plain of the Missouri; with an Account of their Laws, Customs, &c. By Mr. Ellis. 8vo. 9s.

Sketches, representing the Native Tribes, Animals, and Scenery of Southern Africa, from Drawings made by the late Mr. S. Daniell, royal 4to. 3l. 3s. Plates on India paper, 4l. 4s.

Rome, in the Nineteenth Century: containing a Complete Account of the Ruins of the Ancient City, the Remains of the Middle Ages, and the Monuments of Modern Times. 3 vols. post 8vo. 1l. 7s. boards.

THE
BRITISH REVIEW,
AND
LONDON CRITICAL JOURNAL.

JUNE, 1821.

ART. VIII.—GREECE, ANCIENT AND MODERN.

1. *A Classical and Topographical Tour through Greece, in the Years 1801, 1805, and 1806.* By Edward Dodwell, Esq. FRS. 4to. 2 Vols. Rodwell. London, 1820.
2. *Travels to Sicily, Greece, and Albania.* By the Rev. Thomas Smart Hughes. 4to. 2 Vols. Mawman. London, 1820.

THE raptures of those who visit places of ancient renown more frequently belong to affectation than to enthusiasm. Local associations have, it is true, an acknowledged influence over us; but we cannot help suspecting them, in general, of falling far short of that intensity of feeling, which it is the fashion of our day to ascribe to them. Of those who swell the tribe of Italian tourists, not a few, we apprehend, are at this moment toiling with their Cicerones, or their Vasi's Itinerary, through the monuments of ancient Rome, with no other recollections than those of the comforts on which they turned their backs when they left the pier of Dover. And some have scribbled their names in the Parthenon, or the temple of Theseus, and traversed the plains of Marathon, without one sentiment beyond that of disgust at the privations of their journey. It is fortunate, however, for the credit of our country, that scarcely more than half a dozen of professed idlers have betaken themselves to Greece as a refuge from themselves, or an escape from the oppression of existence. Restless nights on sleep-destroying beds, wretched dinners on a Turkish pilaff, wine impregnated with rosin, not to mention a long catalogue of other incommodities which beset a Grecian traveller—give the journey rather too much the aspect of a pilgrimage to be really attractive to the greater part of those whose opportunities and ambition might otherwise prompt them to undertake it.

Those, therefore, who visit Greece, give some proof of the honesty of their enthusiasm; and our reverence for that seat of ancient freedom and art, prompts us to pardon the sentimental fervors which occupy for the most part so large a space in this description of travels. We have, accordingly, made most liberal allowances for the declamatory enthusiasm, and the freaks and curvettings of style, in which Mr. Hughes, in the course of this pleasing and instructive work, instead of proceeding in the regular and sober pace of his learned predecessor Mr. Dodwell, has thought fit to indulge himself. We can easily imagine, however, that he who traverses this sacred track, may witness a new tribe of sensations, while he breathes its purer and more ethereal atmosphere.

Greece is endeared to us by our earliest associations. Its history is made the first stage in the progress of our moral and literary institution. It is there that we learn, as from an elementary tablet, our first lessons in civil and political prudence; that our early virtues receive their first breathings, and are trained and anointed for nobler exercises. It is in the story of Greece that we see our nature and its capacities in its greatest dimensions and most graceful attitudes. Her heroic figures exhibit the celestial mould and gigantic stature of moral prodigies.

There is also a lively interest excited by the tour of Greece, in minds prepared for it by previous culture, by the striking resemblance between its ancient and modern inhabitants. The progeny of Solon and Themistocles are indeed to be traced no longer; (for there is not to be found at Athens, blood that has descended from higher sources than the nobles of Constantinople, the Notara, and Logotheti, familiar names to the Byzantine historians;) yet many circumstances contribute to keep up an identity of national character, and to sustain the charm which fascinates the lovers of antiquity. In this respect, the continuity is more perfect between ancient and modern Athens, than that of ancient and modern Rome. The Coliseum and the Pantheon tell us, in silent but impressive language, the tale of departed grandeur; but, amongst the present Italians, where are the resemblances that remind us of the old masters of the world? In Greece, on the other hand, we are perpetually put in mind of the domestic life and private manners of the ancients, by the habits and usages which still characterize the scene. But the existing language of that country, perhaps more than any other coincidence, keeps the chain unbroken. The Italian, on the other hand, though Latin is one of the elements out of which it has been formed, bears a much slighter relation to that tongue, and is less distinguished in that respect from the other idioms of

the west, which were built on the same foundations, than is generally supposed. Not that we are comparing the Italian which, by a singular fortune, after a series of foreign pollutions and a constant course of change, has become one of the most copious and harmonious languages of Europe, with the feeble and emasculated Rōmaic: but, inasmuch as the latter language, defective as it is, still retains the idiom, the phrase, and the terminations of the mother tongue, it operates more powerfully in recalling the recollection of the ages that are gone. Perhaps there is no modern language, with the single exception of the Arabic, that preserves more of its original structure. An Athenian, of the age of Demosthenes, would find less difficulty in conversing with the present Greek, than a contemporary of Froissart, or of William of Malmsbury, would experience in conversing with ourselves. Much as it has degenerated from that wonderful idiom, which was a kind of music of the mind, swelling to every note of passion, and strengthening every precept of wisdom,—it still has tones and vocal inflexions which strongly bespeak its history. The lyre is not quite unstrung, though the master-hands are no more, that awakened it to melody. It still breathes a sweetness that transports us over the chasm of interposing years, and carries us back to those periods which have rendered it so dear to posterity. In truth, the chief difference is in the pronunciation. There is no doubt that if a Greek scholar would cast off his Gothic accentuation, and condescend to learn the tones of a modern Greek, he would be easily understood at Athens or Constantinople.

Adverting to the short period during which Greek was the language of the Imperial Court, its existence, even in its present mutilated form, will strike us as nearly miraculous. Its impetuosity and vigour are gone; but the modern Greeks are still punctiliously nice about its cadences and its inflexions. The verbs have lost those changes of termination which imparted so much variety to the ancient diction, being now, as in the western dialects of Europe, conjugated with the auxiliary. The aorists also, which, by a wonderful refinement in the philosophy of grammar, denoted the minutest differences of time in human transactions, and the dual number,—these are gone: but the declensions are not materially altered, and the frame of the language remains much as it was. It must be confessed, indeed, that even this identity of language, imperfect as it is, is scarcely to be traced at Athens; for, it is a strange problem, but an undoubted fact, that the dialect which was once the discourse of Pericles and Aspasia, and the admiration of Greeks and barbarians, is now the most corrupt both in idiom and pronunciation, and the ridicule and opprobrium of the rest of Greece, being little better than a

patchwork of Italian, Sclavonian, and Albanian, superinduced upon the old language. Nor is it easy to trace the causes and stages of this depravation. It is certainly not recent, for Meursius in 1578, nearly two hundred and fifty years ago, observed that of all the Grecian dialects, the Attic was the worst. A much purer diction is to be met with in some of the islands of the Archipelago and the Ionian Sea; but the best modern Greek is spoken in the Fanar * of Constantinople, where the ruined countries of the Moldavian and Wallachian governments still retain their palaces. The Greek that is written or spoken there is indeed depraved, but its chief corruptions may be traced to the Hellenic itself, without foreign admixtures; and the learned ear might dwell with delight on sentences of pure and unmixed diction from a Fanariot Beyzarde, of whose nobility and fashion the purity of his language is deemed the surest criterion.

Added to the charm of language, the classical tourist will experience, at every instant, the recurrence of the usages and institutions to which we have already alluded, and which bring ancient and modern Greece into contact with each other. Some of these interesting coincidences have been collected by the late Mr. Frederick Douglas, in his pleasing Essay on the Ancient and Modern Greeks. Many have been incidentally pointed out by Mr. Hughes. Of these customs, particularly those of their dress, &c. many still exist in the first freshness of antiquity; and many of them as they were depicted by Homer on the shield of Achilles. The marriage ceremonial, for instance, so minutely painted in that passage, is still, with due allowance for the change of religion, preserved amongst the present Greeks. It is a remarkable fact, that there is scarcely a circumstance in this ceremony, described by Catullus in his Epithalamium, which is not still practised. The tears of the bride, and her dissembled repugnance, to all appearance as strong as if the fate of Iphigenia awaited her—the Fescennine licence of the hymeneal songs—the nuts showered on her as she moves in the procession, are still to be observed in every part of *Grecia Propria*. Homer's exquisite description also of the dance, is an image of festive delight still to be seen in the Islands. As to the beauty and elegance of the Romaica, there seems a great difference in the sentiments of travellers. "Graceful and splendid," says Mr. Douglas, after citing Homer's description from the fourteenth book of the *Iliad*, "it loses nothing by reality. *The Romaica, the usual dance of the islanders in the Archipelago, has been faithfully represented by Homer; and any account which I can give of it is little more than a feeble copy of that beautiful picture."

"The rapid and frequent change of figure," says Dr. Holland, vol. i. p. 243, "renders the Romaica a very pleasing dance, and perhaps the best of those that are become national." Whereas Mr. Dodwell observes, "that it is a dance composed of many performers round a large circle, jumping first with the one foot, then with the other, without any pretensions to grace, elegance, or activity." Dodwell's Tour, vol. ii. p. 21. And a later traveller (Mr. Turner) describes it in terms that are far from flattering: "Such as wished to dance formed a ring, and they all danced round a blazing pan of charcoal." "Without any doubt," he says, "the Romaica is the stupidest dance ever invented. A party of Greeks, in their holiday array, and assembled in the air among beautiful and romantic scenery, must always have an interesting and picturesque appearance; and it is only on this account (and allowing for the general passion of praising any thing foreign) that I can imagine how any traveller can have expressed any applause of so stupid a dance as the Romaica." Turner's Tour to the Levant, vol. iii. p. 74. It was, however, very natural for a youthful traveller, overflowing with classical recollections, to confound the pleasure derived from its resemblance to antiquity with that which a graceful execution affords. For it is this which is the real source of the emotion, and perhaps the remark is equally applicable to the whole catalogue of usages derived from the better days of Greece, and still preserved by its descendants.

Nor is the modern Greek himself an uninteresting object of contemplation; although it must be confessed that he illustrates the discouraging distinction of Aristotle between the *εύγενης* and the *γενησιώται*. He is still, in respect of cunning, levity, acuteness, pliability, the *Græculus esuriens* of Juvenal; vain, and unmindful of veracity. The character of the modern Athenian seems to be modified, as it was formerly, by the peculiarity of his climate, than which nothing can be more delicious. The heat of the summer is mitigated by a regular gale, which, according to Mr. Dodwell, (vol. ii. p. 8,) so reduced the temperature, that the thermometer seldom rose higher than 85° Fahrenheit. The air of Attica was always esteemed for its superior purity; and its dryness and subtilty have been supposed, in all times, to have contributed to the lightness of spirits, for which the inhabitants of that province were remarkable, and which distinguished them, in their own opinion at least, from the race who inhabited the unwholesome marshes of Bœotia; a theory which is, however, more than slightly impaired by the splendid exceptions of Pindar and Epaminondas. The modern Athenian is lively, ardent, and ingenious; he is still famous for the smartness of his repartees, his

inconstancy, and his eagerness for news. The interrogatory which struck Demosthenes so forcibly, *τι καινον*, is still the same, but corrupted into *τι κινηριον*. He is still a tyrannical and factious animal. He revenges the oppressions and insults he is daily receiving from the Turks, by wanton cruelties on those who are placed under his power; on the poor inhabitants, for instance, of Ægina and Salamis;—and the election of an annual magistrate, who is still mocked with the title of Archon, excites factions and tumults not easily extinguished. But the physical is more striking than the moral identity. Their forms are light and elastic, and every lineament bespeaks the Greek of early times. “I can scarcely trust myself,” says Mr. Douglas, “to describe the beauty of a Greek girl, when arriving at the age which the Greeks have so gracefully personified as the *Χρυσόχρομος* ‘*Ἡῆρ*.’” The islands of Andro, Tino, and, above all, of Crete, contain forms, in copying which the chissel of Praxiteles would not have been misemployed. Their countenances are brightened by a perpetual vivacity, which never visits the downcast countenances of the men; though the delicacy of their forms soon gives way to the heat of the climate and the immoderate use of the warm bath. But this description will not, it seems, apply to the Athenian women. “There is no part of Greece,” says Mr. Dodwell, vol. ii. p. 24, “where the women are so plain. We look in vain for the sylph-like forms which enrapture us in their statues and cameos.”

Every heart must sympathize in the sufferings of Greece under her haughty and profligate oppressors; and the emancipation of that interesting country from the galling servitude by which it is impoverished and desolated, would be a spectacle over which the patriot and the philosopher would equally exult. There is no moral and political unfitness which opposes the project: those who have had the best opportunity of studying the present character of the Greeks, attribute its innumerable defects to the tyranny and the exactions which overwhelm them, to the debasing and frivolous superstitions of their church, and to the ignorance and obstinacy of their clergy.

“Nothing,” says Mr. Dodwell, “is so inimical to the regeneration of the Greeks as the overbearing power and extreme bigotry of their spiritual pastors, who exercise a double tyranny over the minds and bodies of their flocks; nipping the force of their native genius, and reducing nature by long and severe mortifications. Nor must we omit this important consideration,—that almost all the faults of the Greeks are owing to their present cruel oppression; and that if under such circumstances they are not worse than other nations, there is every reason to suppose, that they would be inferior to no other people in

wisdom and virtue, if they were blessed with a just government and a tolerant religion." (Vol. ii. p. 14.)

This sentiment is echoed by our other intelligent traveller Mr. Hughes. But this desirable event, the dream at once, and the hope of the enlightened mind, is still at an immeasurable distance. "Knowledge," says Mr. Hughes, "is increasing and will increase; with knowledge, not only the desire of freedom, but the fitness for it will increase also; true patriotism will spread through all ranks, and when Greece shall escape from bondage corporeal and intellectual, then its genius will revive." (Vol. ii. p. 72.) Every feeling man will join in these aspirations. But that which it is permitted us to hope, it is sometimes irrational to expect, and wicked and mischievous prematurely to attempt. Sonnini and many other writers have preached up a new crusade for the independence of Greece and her rescue from infidel hands; but it could hardly have been expected that their ravings would have found countenance or sanction from the travellers of so inquisitive and meditative a nation as Great Britain. Yet we were surprised to find that the absurdity is still cherished. Mr. Turner,* whom we have more than once quoted, because he is the most recent traveller into those regions, breaks out into the following exclamation:

"The Greeks have vices in a greater degree than most other nations; but they are the vices of a slave; and if the other kingdoms of Europe would attempt (and they would assuredly be able) to emancipate the Greeks, Europe would be an incalculable gainer, and the Greeks, *in the course of two or three centuries*, would become a very fine nation, for time would be necessary to eradicate their long habits of baseness and slavery. Would to God, I could see the experiment tried!"

Surely this is the false gallop of political speculation. It begins, however, at the inverse end of the process. Emancipate them first, says this gentleman, and give them two or three centuries to get rid of their vices. Correct their vices, and then emancipate them, or, what is the same thing, let them emancipate themselves, says common sense; but if in the order of human things two or three centuries are to elapse, before the moral soil is fitted for the experiment, we must submit to the destination. All premature attempts, all anticipations of the slow progress of human improvement, will only aggravate what they aim at removing. Nor is it quite so clear that the sudden ascendancy of the Greeks would be an unequivocal blessing to the country itself. The worst tyrant is an enfranchised slave; and the history

* Turner's *Tour to the Levant*, vol. i. p. 438.

of Wallachia and Moldavia may convince us that even a Turkish Pasha might be regretted by the subjects of a Greek Vaivode. We are far, therefore, from considering the period of Greek restoration to be near; and in spite of the revolutionary examples of the Continent, we hold it to be a British, and, on that account, not the less a philosophical sentiment, to expect no lasting reformation, or solid benefit, from changes where the work has not begun with the correction of those practices and principles which debase the national character. Were it our fate to behold this consummation in Greece, we should indeed rejoice to see her awake from the torpid sleep of ages, and rise majestically to view as a new star in the political firmament.

Γὰρ πῆσεν, ἀλλ' ἀνεγείρομενα
Χρῶτα λαμπρῇ, Ἐωσφορος θα-
ήτος ὡς, ἀστροῖς ἐν ἀλλοῖς.

After these observations, not foreign indeed to the subject of the present article, but which have detained us awhile from the works of Mr. Dodwell and Mr. Hughes, we now proceed to the more specific part of our duty. It is not too much to say, that we have perused them with a pleasure only inferior to that of actually visiting the delightful regions which they delineate. We have selected them from the large mass of travels with which our table is groaning, and which threaten us with satiety on subjects of all others the most interesting to literary curiosity, but on which too great an exuberance of information wearies attention, encumbers the memory, and dissipates and distracts enquiry; and our principal motive for the selection is, that they are both intrinsically classical, as well as topographically illustrative of the country. To both of them, we must give credit for a full and overflowing fund of that previous learning, without which, to visit distant countries is but to wander; and a man, as Lord Bacon remarks, "goeth rather to school than to travel." But we have also been influenced by another reason,—the contrast of manner exhibited by these travellers in the grave and cautious industry with which one has gleaned the materials for his elaborate work; and the fire and animation with which the other has traversed the same ground, without, however, in the slightest degree diminishing our confidence in the facts which he relates. Mr. Hughes resembles some of the modern French writers upon Greece, in his exuberance of sentiment upon every topic connected with his subject; but he has not, like Savary or Sonnini, disgusted his readers by an affected contempt for established opinions and sound learning, and that idle and false philosophy which characterizes the parti-

cular school of taste and of politics, to, which those travellers belonged. He has comprehended in his Tour a wider extent of country than Mr. Dodwell, whose researches, with the exception of one or two of the Ionian Islands, have been for the most part confined to Proper Greece; having given us a slight but interesting sketch of Sicily, and a more detailed account of Albania, particularly of that extraordinary man who has lately swayed the fortunes of that part of Greece (the ancient Epirus) than is to be found in any other author.

Much praise is due to Mr. Dodwell for the fidelity with which the features of the country have been delineated in the numerous drawings which accompany his work. To accomplish this object, he appears to have spared no sacrifice of time or of money. The greater part of the drawings were executed by a Roman artist, who accompanied him on his travels, and many of them were made by the author himself. The work is the substance of tours made at several times; the first in 1801, and the other in 1805 and 1806, and the late appearance of the work is accounted for by the long detention of Mr. Dodwell in France, in consequence of Buonaparte's frantic and capricious decree against the British who were then in that country. We shall not follow our traveller in his first Grecian expedition, which occupies a very inconsiderable space in his book, and comprises merely an uninteresting, and we must be permitted to add, tedious survey of the islands and coast of Dalmatia, (in which no notice occurs of Pola, the only object worthy of antiquarian research,) and a description of Corfu, which is unnecessarily prolonged by an imperfect history of ancient Corcyra. In the same voyage, he touched at Santa Maura (Leucadia) and thence sailed to Ithaca, of which he has given only a general description. The account, however, given of it both by Sir William Gell and Mr. Dodwell, would perplex us in assigning a rational cause for the predilection cherished for it by Ulysses. Cicero probably solves the problem. "*Non quia larga, sed quia sua.*" It ought to be observed also, that the exact situation of the Homeric Ithaca is still a matter of learned controversy, that will probably never be decided.* In this tour Mr. Dodwell proceeded to Athens, the islands of the Archipelago, the coast of Troy, and Constantinople. On his second tour, four years afterwards, he examined the country in greater detail, and it is this journey which forms the subject matter of his learned and elaborate work.

Our author sailed from Sicily in the early part of 1805, and

* The medals bearing the head of Ulysses, said to have been found in Ithaca, prove but little. They were struck many centuries after the Ithacensian kings.

arriving in sixty hours at Zacynthus* (or according to Mr. Dodwell's Greek orthography Zakunthos) broke out, as he entered the port of the island, into the following rapture, which we transcribe as no unfaithful copy of the impressions with which the classical eye would cast its first glances on the shores of Greece.

"I cannot describe the sensations which I experienced, on approaching the classic shores of Greece. My mind was agitated by the delights of the present, and the recollections of the past. The land which had been familiar to my ideas from early impressions, seemed as if by enchantment, thrown before my eyes. I beheld the native soil of the great men whom I had so often admired; of the poets, historians, and orators, whose works I had perused with delight, and to whom Europe has been indebted for so much of her high sentiment, and her intellectual cultivation. I gazed upon the region which had produced so many artists of unrivalled excellence, whose works are still admired as the models of perfection, and the standards of taste. All these ideas crowding into the mind, made a deep impression; and fixed me for some time, in a contemplative, but pleasurable reverie. The view before me comprehended the most interesting countries in the classic world. In the more immediate vicinity was Zakunthos, with its hills of soft verdure, and its plains of varied wealth; with the town, the fortress, the port, and Mount Scopo, the ancient Elatos, towering above with its pointed top. The Messenian and Arcadian mountains skirted one part of the distant horizon with a faint and varying outline, while the eye glanced on the peaceful shores of Elis, on the fertile plains of Achaia, the rugged elevations of Locris, Ætolia, Acarnania, and Epiros, covered with snow. The scattered Echinades, with the islands of Ithaca and Cephallenia, powerfully attracted the attention; and the whole "Laertia regna," with those regions of ancient Greece, which are of the most general celebrity, and the highest renown, were brought at once into the field of view. There was ample gratification for the eye and for the mind." (Vol. i. p. 78, 79.)

The quarantine regulations prevented our traveller from landing at this island. Mr. Hughes was more fortunate. He sailed from Messina in 1812, and passed some time at Zante. Its whole circumference is about seventy miles. Many of its villages and hamlets are delightfully disposed in the retreating folds of mountain ridges, where the myrtle, vine, and olive still grow in profusion. The climate is temperate; the summer heat is cooled by sea breezes, and in the winter the snow never remains on the ground. Athenæus praises the wine of Zacynthus for its strength, and it still retains that quality. The advantage of British pro-

* However desirable it might be to adhere to the original orthography of proper names, the custom of modifying them in different countries is too well established to be departed from, without incurring the appearance of affectation or pedantry. The Roman poets have naturalized Zacynthus to our ear. The present name of the island (Zante) is a gross barbarism.

tection is every day more manifest; and among its beneficial results may be reckoned the completion of an excellent mole, which affords perfect security to ships, and the construction of excellent roads. Its commerce and its revenues are fast increasing, and the money expended by British residents is improving visibly the condition of the people. Oranges, lemons, citrons are amongst the principal articles of its exportations, for which it chiefly receives specie in return.

“The currants of Zante form the principal article of exportation; the weight of about 80,000 cwt. being sent annually to England, Holland, Sweden, Germany, and Venice, though the first mentioned country consumes more than all the rest together. The delicate plant which produces this fruit (*Vitis Corinthiaca*) rises to the height of about three or four feet, being very thick in branches and leaves, the latter of which are much smaller than those of the common vine: it is subject to great injury from insects when it begins to shoot, from early frosts in the spring, and from heavy rains at the time of flowering. Its fruit, when ripe, is of the size of our largest red currant, of a rich purple colour, hanging in long and beautiful clusters: its luscious flavour is agreeably tempered with a slight acidity, which renders it a very favourite article in the dessert. This vine requires a very peculiar soil and situation for its arrival at perfection: the first ought to be dry and flinty with a sufficient mixture of light clay or loam; the second should be near the sea and sheltered from the violence of the wind:—hence it will flourish only on the north or north-west coasts of the Morea, and the islands of Zante, Cephalonia and Ithaca: its culture has been attempted at Santa Maura and the other Ionian Islands, but without success. The vine begins to bear well in its seventh year, and will last near a century if proper care and attention be paid to manure it and add fresh soil whenever it begins to show exhaustion. The grape ripens in the end of July, but the vintage does not commence till the end of August; the clusters when gathered are conveyed away in baskets, and laid upon a smooth floor formed by a fine mastic cement which prevents earthy particles from mingling with the grapes: on this floor they are carefully spread and turned every day: if the weather should prove very rainy, the hopes of the cultivator are totally destroyed: if it be fine (and it rarely happens otherwise) the fruit becomes dry in ten or twelve days; it is then cleared from external substances, and deposited in warehouses, where it emits that viscous fluid which coagulates it so closely, that a pickaxe is sometimes required to separate the mass, before it can be put into casks for exportation.” (Vol. i. p. 146, 147.)

It is a subject of honest delight to British feelings to witness the advance of this island in the career of civil and political blessings under the administration of its present protectors. Crimes of the utmost atrocity were committed with impunity under the Venetian and even under the French government. Law and justice have at length resumed their reign. The terrible incursions of the bar-

barians in the middle ages have left in Zante scarcely one vestige of ancient art. The discovery of the tomb of Cicero, pretended to have been laid open by workmen digging for the foundation of a Latin church in the year 1544, scarcely deserves the slightest mention. The form of the letters sufficiently detects the imposture. It is not to be supposed that the secret of his sepulchre should not have transpired,—of him whose memory was held in so religious a veneration by the Romans for ages after his inhuman murder on the shore of Caieta, that the spot where he fell continued long to be visited as a place of pilgrimage. The spirit of discovery, and the success attending the researches of our countrymen in the Ionian Islands, have, however, brought to light many interesting antiquities illustrative of the arts, manners, and domestic life of the ancient people of these islands. It is an extraordinary fact, that these discoveries, consisting of embossed and figured chalices, pateræ, vases, chains, and other ornaments of the finest gold, were extracted from the receptacles of the dead. As nothing like them was ever discovered in any other part of Greece, they enable us to form an estimate of the former wealth, commerce, and population of these western islanders. Such discoveries have naturally excited no small sensation among the literati of the Ionian Islands; and a multifarious correspondence, comprising both learned conjecture and ingenious commentary, was carried on in the *Ionian Ephemeris* or *Zante Gazette*, a periodical work lately established there, from which Mr. Hughes draws the most encouraging auguries of the moral and social improvement of the modern Greeks.

Mr. Dodwell determined to proceed through Phocis and Bœotia to revisit the spots he had seen on his first journey, and to examine others which he had then neglected: he remained at Patras to make arrangements for his tour, which he considered as commencing in that place. He proceeded along the gulph of Corinth, and arrived at Galaxīdi, whence he set out for Salōna (the ancient Amphīssa) and still the largest city of the Hesperian or Ozolian Locris, and reached it in about five hours. The Acropolis, whose place is now occupied by the castle, is a mass of ruins. Salōna is about six miles from Krisso, and at this latter place he had an opportunity, by means of a letter of introduction to the Bishop, of seeing, for the first time, the interior of a Greek family. As some of their domestic customs are curious and interesting, we subjoin Mr. Dodwell's relation.

"Before sitting down to dinner, as well as afterwards, we had to perform the ceremony of the *χρυσισπρον*, or washing of the hands: a tin basin, which the Turks name *levenn*, is brought round to all the company, the servant holding it on his left arm, while with the other hand, he pours water from a tin vessel, called by the Turks *ibrik*, on

the hands of the washer, having a towel thrown over his shoulder, to dry them with. The towel is called *Μανδύλη*, from the ancient word *μαγδαλία*. This ceremony is performed not only before and after meals, but is practised by Greeks and Turks before commencing their orations, as it was by the ancients before they sacrificed to the gods, and on the arrival of a stranger at a house. The bason was called *λέσης*, and not *μεταλπιτρον*, as some have supposed, the latter being the draught taken after dinner, when the *niptron*, or washing, was finished.

Χερνίβα δ' ἀμφιπόλος προχωρῶ επεχευς φερουσα
Καλῇ, χρυσεῖῃ, ὑπερ ἀργυρεοῖο λεβήτος,
Νιψασθῆναι.

“Several other authors mention the same custom.

“We dined at a round table of copper tinned, called, in the Turkish language, *siny*, supported upon one leg or column, like the *monopodia* of the ancients. We sat on cushions placed on the floor; and our dress not being so conveniently large as that of the Greeks, we found the greatest difficulty in tucking our legs under us, or rather sitting upon them, as they do with perfect ease and pliability. Several times I was very near falling back, and overturning the episcopal table, with all its good things. The Bishop insisted upon my Greek servant sitting at table with us; and on my observing that it was contrary to our custom, he answered, that he could not bear such ridiculous distinctions in his house. It was with difficulty I obtained the privilege of drinking out of my own glass, instead of out of the large goblet, the *κελιξ φιλοτισίας*, or *poculum amicitiae*, which served for the whole party, and which had been whiskered by the Bishop, and the rest of the company, for both the Greeks and Turks use only one glass at meals.

“The Greeks seldom drink until they have dined. Xenophon mentions the same custom among the ancients. When the dinner was finished, and the *χειρολιπτρον* was performed, a draught of wine was taken by each person, and it was termed *μεταλπιτρον*, from being taken after the *niptron*, or washing, was over. This is the explanation of Athenæus, and of many authors whom he cites.

“After dinner, strong thick coffee, without sugar, was handed round: the cup is not placed in a saucer, but in another cup of metal, which the Turks call *zarf*, and which defends the fingers from being burnt; for the coffee is served up and drank as hot as possible.

“I observed at this place a custom which is prevalent throughout Greece, and which seems to be of ancient date: the houses have no bells, and the servants are called by the master clapping his hands. Pausanias, in his description of a painting by Polygnotos, says that Paris is represented clapping his hands to call Penthesilea, who is seen in the picture.” (Vol. i. p. 156, 157.)

On quitting Krisso, about half way to Kastri, a vast precipice renders the approach to the far famed Delphi awfully grand and strikingly picturesque. The road is here extremely narrow; a precipice is overlooked on the right hand, and a rock rises on the left. There can be no doubt that this is the spot described by Livy,

where some Macedonians way-laid and attempted to destroy Eumenes, king of Pergamus. The computed distance from Salôna to Krisso is two hours, and from Krisso to Kastri as much more, answering to the computation of Pausanias, who makes the distance from Amphissa to Delphi about 120 stadia. The approach to this place, when its gods, its temples, and the various objects of its superstition were in their meridian splendour, must have been well calculated to strike with religious awe the de-luded but sincere votary. Its sublime and terrific scenery, its ancient celebrity, and its prostrate and ruined condition, still cause, in the mind of the classical spectator, a vibration of feeling between melancholy and admiration. The very place once breathed the presence of Apollo; and the fascinated imagination still confesses the local illusion. In the back ground of this magnificent picture, the precipices of Parnassus rise in almost perpendicular grandeur, and its valley is excluded from the rest of the world by the rough and barren rocks which surround it. The most interesting spot amongst the ruins of Delphi is the Castalian spring. It is about two hundred yards from the village, at the base of the Parnassian precipices. The two celebrated rocks, the Phædriades, which give the name of biceps to the mountain, rise above the fountain perpendicularly, exhibiting the two celebrated points of Nauplia and Hyampia, sacred to Bacchus and Apollo. The chasm by which they are separated, is not more than five or six yards in breadth.

"The Kastalian spring is clear, and forms an excellent beverage; but I confess that its waters produced none of those effects upon me, which were felt by travellers of more lively imaginations, or more tender stomachs, than myself.

"Nil tum Castaliæ rivis communibus undæ
Dissimiles——

"Dr. Spon, it seems, was converted into a poet by its draught! while, in Dr. Chandler (a far more credible fact), it manifested its effects in a stomach-ache and a shivering fit. But if similar results were the uniform product of the Kastalian spring, we might expect to find all the inhabitants of Kastri particularly liable to rigid shiverings, or poetic ecstasies.

"The water which oozes from the rock, was in ancient times introduced into a hollow square, where it was retained for the use of the Pythia and the oracular priests. Some steps that are cut in the rock formed a descent to this bath. The face and sides of the precipice, which inclose the spring, have been cut and flattened: it was no doubt anciently covered in; for it cannot well be imagined that the Pytho-ness laved her holy limbs in open day. A circular niche, which was probably designed for a statue, is cut in the face of the rock: a small arch and passage is seen on the western side a little above the usual level of the spring: this was made to let off the superfluous water. At

the opposite side is the diminutive chapel of St. John, which seems to have been contrived in order to exhibit the triumph of the cross, over the adoration of Apollo and the Muses!

"The fountain is ornamented with pendant ivy, and overshadowed by a large fig tree, the roots of which have penetrated the fissures of the rock, while its wide-spreading branches throw a cool and refreshing gloom over this interesting spot. At the front of the spring we were gratified by the sight of a majestic plane tree, that nearly defends it from the rays of the sun, which shines on it only a few hours in the day. Homer, in his Hymn to Apollo, mentions the fount Delphousa at this place; probably meaning the Kastalian.

"Above the Phæacjades is a plain, and a small lake, the waters of which enter a *katabathron*, or chasm; and it is probably from this that the Kastalian spring is supplied. The superfluous water, after trickling amongst the rocks, crosses the road, and enters a modern fount, from which it makes a quick descent to the bottom of the valley, through a narrow and rocky glen, fringed with olive and mulberry trees, when it joins the little river Pleistos, and enters the sea near the ruins of Kirra. While we were at Delphi, the Kastalian spring was flowing in a copious stream, and formed several small cascades, the appearance of which was highly picturesque. The sides of the fountain were covered with fine water-cresses: I gathered some for dinner, which the poor people observing, asked if they were medicinal; and when I explained to them how they were to be eaten, they communicated the discovery to the others; and the next morning, I met a party of the villagers returning from the spring, each with a provision of the newly-discovered vegetable: they thanked me for the information I had given them; and pointing to their cresses, told me they should for the future give them the name *φρανκοχορτον*, or the Frank's Herb. The poorer Greeks, particularly those who live far from the sea, have so little to eat during their long and rigorous fasts, that the discovery of a new vegetable, which they did not know was palatable or wholesome, was a circumstance of some importance to them." (Dodwell's Travels, vol. i. p. 172—174.)

Sir George Wheeler discovered a virtue in the Castalian waters which neither Spots, Chandler, nor Mr. Dodwell attribute to them. "It is very good and cool," observes that facetious old traveller, "fit to quench the thirst of those hot-brained poets, who, in their bacchanals spare neither God nor man, and to whom nothing is sacred but they will venture to profane it." * We never perused this passage, for we often turn to the quaint but accurate relations of this antiquated tourist both for information and delight, without breathing in silent ejaculation, a hearty wish that one at least of our modern race of poets, and who from these beautiful regions has derived the richest ornaments of his verse, had drunk profusely at the salubrious fountain.

* Wheeler's Travels, p. 315.

In such a scene as the "Delphic mountains," no wonder that Mr. Hughes should feel himself exalted above prose, and give vent to his feelings in a diction corresponding to their fervour. We remember, however, the glowing colours in which Dr. Clarke, in the fourth volume of his interesting *Travels*, delineated these grand and inspiring scenes.

"There is enough," says he "remaining to enable a skilful architect to form an accurate plan of Delphi; but it should be fitted to a model of Parnassus; for in the harmonious adjustment, which was here conspicuous of the works of God and man, every stately edifice and majestic pile constructed by human labour, were made to form a part of the awful features of the mountains, and from whatever quarter Delphi was approached, a certain solemn impression of supernatural agency must have been excited, diffusing its influence, over every object: so that the sanctity of the whole district became a saying throughout Greece, and 'ALL PARNASSUS WAS ACCOUNTED HOLY.'"

It is a singular feature of this stupendous scene, that the ancient city stood on terraces of a semicircular form, successively rising over each other, and resembling, on a large scale, the seats of an amphitheatre.

"The site is compared by Strabo to a vast natural theatre, and the comparison is just even to the minutest details; for the city was not only built in a fine semicircular sweep of the mountain, but suspended, as it were, upon regular gradations of terraces built in the Cyclopæan style of masonry: these therefore would not unaptly represent the ranges of seats, whilst the Lycoræan crags towering aloft around the colon, might be likened to the great gallery or portico of the Greek theatre; the deep valley of the Pleistus in front of Delphi gives an adequate space for the proscenium, and the scene itself is displayed in the opposite heights of Cirphis. Such was this colossal theatre where deities and their satellites composed the drama! How splendid must have been its effect when Art contended with Nature for pre-eminence in its decoration! when with these solemn cliffs and venerable masses of rock, the stately majesty of the Doric temple, and the light elegance of the columnated portico, was beautifully contrasted!—when all these artfully constructed terraces held up to universal admiration masterpieces of ancient sculpture, and the curling incense rose from a thousand altars! It must be confessed that the view corresponded with the sublime ideas of those inspired bards who represented this holy mountain as the resort of celestial beings, where they delighted to celebrate their festivals and lead the heavenly choirs:

"But when the goddess of the chase forsakes
Her pleasure and unbends her silver bow,
To Delphi's wealthy shrine her course she takes,
To guide the sweetest chorus earth can know,
Muses and Graces mixt.

How great must have been the astonishment of the ancient pilgrim after he had toiled over many a wearisome stage to view this solemn sanctuary, this common altar of all nations, when the splendid scene burst upon his sight with all the decoration of pomp and sacrifice, whilst the hollow rocks reverberated the clang of trumpets, the neighing of steeds, and the shouts of assembled multitudes." (Hughes's Travels, vol. i. p. 355, 356.)

Mr. Dodwell was impatient to visit the Temple of Apollo, or at least the site of it, for its very ruins have disappeared. As all antecedent explorers of these antiquities have committed the grossest blunders in attempting to fix the spot of the Pythian temple, we subjoin this learned antiquary's account of his researches.

"It was in the upper part of the town, and near a magnificent theatre, which indeed was within its peribolos. The Grecian theatres are generally hewn out of the solid rock, and are therefore the most indestructible of ancient monuments; I had reason to hope I should find it, and that it would lead to the discovery of the temple: but I was disappointed; as I could not discover any positive traces of either one or the other. It appears that the far-famed temple of Apollo must be sought for under the humble cottages of Kastri, as the whole village probably stands within its ancient peribolos.

"Pausanias says, that the temple contains a very large space, where several roads meet; and that a fountain, called Kassotis, passes underground in a secret part of it; I therefore directed my steps towards the rocks of Parnassos, in search of the fountain, and soon came to a small stream, running towards the village. I was not remiss in exploring its source, which is situated near a large mass of rock, and several vestiges of antiquity are scattered around. At this spot the Turks have constructed a fountain, with a cistern, for the purpose of collecting the waters, to which the washerwomen of Kastri habitually resort. The adjacent ground exhibits some scattered blocks of considerable magnitude, which render it probable that the fountain was once sumptuously adorned. It is at present called Kerna. A little above it are some ancient foundations, perhaps the Lesche, which contained the paintings of Polygnotos.

"The stream which issues from the spring, runs towards the middle of the village; where it loses itself, imperceptibly, near the Agha's house. There are several remains about this spot; and in the lower part of this and some adjoining houses, are some fluted marble crusts, of the Doric order, and of large dimensions.

"Some very long inscriptions are also still left on the walls, which form part of his granary, and which almost cover one side of a neighbouring cow-house. The proprietor turned out the cattle, and gave me a light, which enabled me to copy a Greek and Latin inscription; and as only a part of it has been published, it will be inserted in the Appendix. It was however in so mutilated a state, besides being in an inverted position, that I copied it with the greatest difficulty." (Dodwell's Travels, vol. i. p. 174, 175.)

Here then we have the inference of Mr. Dodwell, that this celebrated temple was to be sought for under the present village of Kastri. Let us see whether this conjecture does not receive the strongest confirmation from the researches of Mr. Hughes seven years afterwards.

"From hence we passed through the wretched lanes of Castri to the palace of Apollo. Having gained admittance into the shed, we found it so dark and filthy, so full of a corrupted atmosphere from old olive husks and the lees of wine, that we made a hasty retreat until a light could be procured and the place ventilated by admission of the external air: after a considerable lapse of time our messenger returned with a small wax taper, which he had probably abstracted from some picture of the Panagia, for the only lights burned by the poor inhabitants are the dades, or slips of dry wood from the fir called *pinus picea*. By the faint glimmering of this taper we began to explore the recesses of a building which appears actually to have been part of the great Pythian temple, though it be now degraded to so mean an appropriation. The wall which forms the northern side of the present shed, composed of large blocks of hewn stone, is nearly covered with antique inscriptions, those charms which our clerical guide attributed to the work of Genii. These, from the porous nature of the stone, the corrosion of time, and accidental defacement, appear to defy the ingenuity of man to decypher: at least he who attempts the work ought to have a better day, better health, and longer time than fell to my lot at this period. After much consideration I at length fixed upon one block which seemed to offer the best chance of success, after which I was obliged to sit upon a heap of filth in a very painful posture to copy it, whilst Mr. Parker with great good-nature and patience held the wax taper close to the stone. The characters were so uncouth, so many were effaced, and the stone so much decayed, that the document did not prove so satisfactory as I could have wished: but I was unable either to re-copy it or to attempt another, since the operation had cost me already near three hours of painful labour: still it was a pleasure to discover in it the name of the Pythian Apollo, which certainly tends to strengthen the conjecture, that the wall on which it is inscribed formed one side of the Pythian cella." (Hughes's *Travels*, vol. i. p. 375, 376.)

Of this inscription, which is very imperfect and mutilated, the substance seems to be the dedication, by a lady named Dicæa, of certain slaves to the use of the temple of the Pythian Apollo, and that the forms of law had been observed in the dedication. Then, follow the names of the subscribing witnesses. Mr. Dodwell has preserved in his appendix five of those inscriptions. Annexed to the first volume of Mr. Hughes's work, is a dissertation on the situation of the Pythian temple, by the learned Master of Shrewsbury School, Dr. Butler, in which the site conjectured by Mr. Dodwell and Mr. Hughes is corroborated by ingenious deduction from the writers of antiquity. But the

most authenticated monument of ancient Delphi is the stadium. Its form, that of an oblong, rounded off at one end, is distinctly visible, and the lower tier of seats constructed out of stone, dug from the quarries of Parnassus, still remains; but every trace is gone of the rich marble coating with which it was covered by Herodes Atticus. The arena extended about 640 feet. Mr. Dodwell says, that his search for the Hippodrome was ineffectual. But it has been conjectured, that it may be traced in a beautiful valley between Crissa and Mount Cirphis, at the foot of the Parnassian range. For ourselves, we think that these conjectures are frivolous and useless. It sometimes happened that the ancient Hippodromes were only spaces railed in, without any permanent building. Nor is it at all improbable, that the exercises of the Hippodrome were occasionally performed in the stadium; and in confirmation of this conjecture, we might refer our readers to Julius Pollux,* who expressly classes the ἵππιος δρόμος amongst the gymnastic exercises of the stadium. Of Castri, the village which now stands on the site of the "common city of Greece," Mr. Dodwell remarks that, "the inhabitants exhibit a people in a state of inartificial existence." "They have indeed," he says, "little to do out of their own valley, and their poverty, while it keeps them at home, affords no inducement for the intrusion of the Turks." To a Greek village, the absence of the Turks is of itself a signal blessing. But the catalogue of their positive comforts is small. At the very place where the pampered herald invited the crowds assembled at Delphi to the sumptuous feast furnished by the rich offerings of superstition, a stranger may now think himself sumptuously treated, if he can procure a piece of bread, compared with which that of Sparta would have been a dainty.

It is not without reluctance, that we forbear following Mr. Dodwell to Libadea, to the celebrated plain of Cheronea, and the once magnificent Thebes, a journey illustrated by the most extensive erudition, which a diligent consultation of ancient authors could supply, before we enter with him the Sacred Gate of Athens,* the Mecca of the Grecian pilgrimage, the sanctuary of all that is sublime in genius or elegant in art. The task of describing a place so well known is arduous to a modern traveller, who is anxious to avoid superfluous and tedious reiteration. But notwithstanding the multitude of tourists who have visited this celebrated city, and delineated its almost innumerable antiquities, the subject is so exuberant, that much is still left for examination and research. The defect which chiefly remained to be supplied is that of accurate drawings. Le Roy is

* L. 3, c. 30.

peculiarly faulty in his views. Nor are those of Stuart so faithful as is generally supposed. His plans and measurements are in the highest degree faulty. His drawings of the sculpture of Athens will be found singularly defective, when they are compared with some of the originals now in the British Museum. This defect, it is but justice to say, has been amply supplied by the diligence of Mr. Dodwell, and the principal value of his work is derived from this circumstance. For it is by no means calculated for a popular book. Its details are rendered sometimes unnecessarily heavy, by that cumbrous load of learning, which obscures by too much illustration, and by an apparent conviction which haunted the author that nothing was to be asserted, without turning to the indexes of Pausanias and Strabo, to find what they had said upon the subject. The mass of erudition, which accompanies his description of the Acropolis, might in mere compassion to his readers, have been abridged or omitted.

Of the Aeropolis, the Propylææ, its western entrance, is of course the first object of contemplation. It extended quite across the west end of the Acropolis, and was about 185 feet broad. Mnesicles was the architect whom Pericles appointed to build it. But every thing yields in point of interest to the Parthenon.

“Every edifice of antiquity with which we are acquainted must sink into insignificance when compared with this; which to elegance of taste and splendour of ornament added all the grandeur of sublimity and the majesty of simplicity. It was the very school of architecture and sculpture combined, where each gave additional lustre to the other, and augmented its magical effect; however numerous, however sumptuous were the decorations of this temple, they were all made subservient to design: nor was the unity of this design ever broken into for the sake of ornament. That inimitable frieze representing the Panathenæic procession, a combination of the most spirited and various attitudes which animated nature is capable of assuming, was not visible to the spectator till he came within the portico, whilst the tympana of the the pediments and the metopes, between the triglyphs, were the very places adapted to ornament and even mean without it. And what ornament was there displayed! figures clothed with celestial grace and majesty, exhibiting every essential character of the human form, but free from its defects! the triumph of that genius which could raise its ideas to the contemplation of divinity and embody them. By these immortal works alone is Phidias made known to posterity; and these are enough to justify all the encomiums bestowed upon him by ancient authors; yet even these are far inferior to the chief ornaments of that mighty artist. The statue of the goddess, twenty-six cubits high, which stood in the hypæthral court of this temple, was so wrought in ivory and gold that even the materials themselves were surpassed by the excellence of the workmanship; every part was so elaborately finished that the most scientific eye dwelt with rapture upon its minutest ornaments. Still, even this was sur-

passed by his unrivalled personification of Olympian Love, that statue to which the ancient "unanimously decreed the palm of superiority, and in which the artist was thought to rival the sublimity of the poet.

Ἡ καὶ κολοσσὸς ἐν ὀφείοις ἔκειτο Κρονίου. καὶ τὴν
 Ἀφροδίτην δ' ἄρα χάριτας ἐκπύσσοντο ἄνακτος ἀνδρῶν
 Κρονίδης δὲ ἀδανείοντο μέγαν δ' ἔχοντο Ὀλύμπιον.

What would have been our ideas of ancient art had these works but-lived the ravages of time? Whilst the sculpture of the Parthenon is capable of forming the taste of a nation and eliciting all the genius of its artists, these might have turned emulation itself into despair." (Hughes's Travels, vol. i. p. 257, 258.)

With the idea of the Parthenon is associated that of the spoiliations, which, under the thin cover of a zeal for the arts, have deprived that far-famed temple of its ancient and appropriate ornaments. We cannot admit the force of the pleas urged in vindication of the proceeding. It is a fact well known, that the Athenian Greeks have learned a pretty just estimate of their value; and Dr. Clarke relates an incident, which proves also that the Turks are not wholly insensible to the worth of those admirable remains. Admitting, however, that it became necessary to remove them from the Turks, (an admission which we are by no means disposed to make) it was surely unnecessary to carry away any more, than the pieces, which were separate. Why meddle with those which belonged substantively and integrally to the building, and formed parts of a composition? What, for instance, can justify the removal of one of the Caryatides from the Erechtheum, a column which, with four others, supports the roof, and which, considered merely as a specimen of sculpture, loses all its charms, when abstracted from the building to which it belongs? Mr. Dodwell, who was a witness of these profanations, in what is still called at Athens "the dilapidating year," thus breathes his just indignation:

"During my first tour to Greece I had the inexpressible mortification of being present when the Parthenon was despoiled of its finest sculpture, and when some of its architectural members were thrown to the ground. I saw several metopæ at the south-east extremity of the temple taken down. They were fixed in between the triglyphs as in a groove; and in order to lift them up, it was necessary to throw to the ground the magnificent cornice by which they were covered. The south-east angle of the pediment shared the same fate; and instead of the picturesque beauty and high preservation in which I first saw it, it is now comparatively reduced to a state of shattered desolation.

"It is painful to reflect that these trophies of human genius, which had resisted the silent decay of time, during a period of more than twenty-two centuries, which had escaped the destructive fury of the

Honoklasts, the inconsiderate rapacity of the Venetians, and the barbarous violence of the Mohamedans, should at least have been doomed to experience the devastating outrage which will never cease to be deplored. Independent of the moral blame which must necessarily attach to such an act, the authority of the example may henceforth be pleaded as a precedent, and employed as an apology for similar depredations. The Athenian temples will thus probably be destroyed for the sake of their ornaments; which, instead of remaining in their original places, as the property of all nations, will be appropriated by the strongest. When we come to trace the causes which led to this scene of havoc and destruction, the greater share of the odium will naturally, and not unjustly, be referred to those who first exhibited the example of such unhallowed violations of all that the feeling of genuine taste respects and consecrates. But while we indignantly reprove and deeply regret the irreparable damage that has been done to the Athenian monuments, we must not overlook the advantage which the fine arts in our country will derive from the introduction of such inestimable specimens of Grecian art. But though we make this concession, we cannot omit to observe, that had the temples been left untouched, and had that sculpture only been removed which had already fallen, our Museum would still have been enriched with sufficient specimens for the improvement of the national taste, while casts would have answered every purpose of those originals, of which the temples have been sacrilegiously deprived.

"It is indeed impossible to suppress the feelings of regret which must arise in the breast of every traveller, who has seen these temples before and since their late dilapidation! nor have I any hesitation in declaring, that the Athenians in general, nay, even the Turks themselves, did lament the ruin that was committed; and loudly and openly blamed their sovereign for the permission he had granted! I was on the spot at the time, and had an opportunity of observing, and indeed of participating, in the sentiment of indignation which such conduct universally inspired. The whole proceeding was so unpopular in Athens, that it was necessary to pay the labourers more than their usual profits before any could be prevailed upon to assist in this work of profanation.

"The insulated example of the single sculptured marble which was taken from the temple by the Count de Choiseul Gouffier, and of one of the metopæ which was broken in attempting its removal, is adduced as a palliation of the subsequent dilapidations; but it can never excuse the wanton destruction that ensued; and which I have reason to believe, would not have been carried to such an extraordinary excess, had the person for whom they were removed been present at the time. But the management of the whole affair was in fact committed to the hands of mercenary and interested persons, and executed with all the unprincipled consciousness of subordinate and hireling agents. The temples were entirely at their mercy! and while we grant them the negative merit of not having levelled every thing with the ground, we cannot but execrate that spirit of insensate barbarism which prompted them to shatter and mutilate, to pillage and overturn, the noble works

which the lofty mind of Pericles had ordered, and the unrivalled genius of Phidias and of Iktinos had executed. It is an incontestible fact, that the magnificent monuments of the Athenian Acropolis suffered more in that single dilapidating year, than during the whole preceding century. The Venetians inflicted the first fatal blow upon the Parthenon, when they besieged Athens in 1687. Their artillery laid part of the inimitable structure in ruins. The labours of Iktinos, of Phidias, and of Kallikrates, were disregarded in the rage of war; and for many years they were exposed in scattered heaps to the slow but certain destruction of Turkish ignorance. Large masses of Pentelic marble were broken into smaller pieces for the construction of the miserable cottages of the garrison; while others, and particularly the bas-reliefs, were burnt into lime; for the Turks are said to have preferred for that purpose a sculptured block to a plain one, though the material was the same. Such is the pleasure with which uncivilized ignorance or frantic superstition, destroyed in a moment the works of years, and the admiration of ages!" (Dodwell's Travels, vol. i. p. 322—325.)

The following passage on the same subject, is entitled to serious consideration.

"The sculpture of the Parthenon, and indeed of all temples, was designed for effect; and the intended position of the figures on the edifice was evidently taken into consideration. The inaccuracies, the disproportions, and the apparent negligence observable in some parts, and which are striking when placed on a level with the eye, disappear when elevated to that height, for which the effect was calculated. And there can be little doubt that all the sculpture which has been brought from the Parthenon to this country, with the exception perhaps of the wonderful fragments from the tympana, have lost a great part of their beauty and effect by the removal. Their position in the British Museum is at the same time too high and not high enough. They are too high for the close examination of those artists who might be benefitted by a minute scrutiny of every muscle and movement of the body, as well as every fold and turn of the drapery; but they are not sufficiently elevated to produce that grandeur of effect which was originally designed. We may hope that their position will be improved, when they are placed in the noble edifice, which it is said will at some future period be erected for their reception. In the mean time it may reasonably be apprehended, that long previous to the foundation of the intended gallery, the wooden place which at present contains them will be burnt to the ground, and the marbles of Phidias converted into lime."

"It would perhaps be a question not undeserving the consideration of the trustees of the national Museum, whether the arts of sculpture and design would not be more benefitted, by placing casts at the same height which the marbles originally occupied on the Parthenon, and by lowering the marbles themselves to the level of the eye." (Dodwell's Travels, vol. i. p. 337, 338.)

It gives us a gigantic conception of the Parthenon, when we

advert to the character and extent of its ornaments. The Pæantheaic procession was carried quite round the exterior frieze of the cella for 525 feet. Every tympanon was seventy feet long, and contained colossal statues of the most exquisite workmanship. These embellishments inspire us with a grand idea of the taste of Pericles, and of the wealth of Athens in that age of splendour. The figures are in different styles of taste. Each sculptor seems (for many were employed in this great work,) to have adjusted the drapery agreeably to his own fancy. Mr. Dodwell ingeniously observes, that "the whole procession appears as if it had been summoned in the dead of the night, and every person had put on those parts of his dress which happened to present themselves at the moment. But it is from this seeming confusion, this variety of attitudes, of dress and preparation, of precipitancy and care, of busy movement and relaxed effort, that the composition derives so much of its effect." To the north of the Parthenon, are the united temples of Neptune Erectheus, Minerva Polias, and Pandrosos. When Mr. Dodwell was first at Athens, the eastern front of the Erectheum had an hexastyle colonnade of exquisite proportions; but only five of the columns remain; one of them having been taken away by the dilapidators, and deposited in the British Museum. We regret to add, that in consequence of this abstraction some of the wall of the cella has been destroyed, with part of the architrave and frieze, and north-east pilaster. The place of this column, the subject of this barbarous and unprincipled spoliation, was at first ignominiously filled up with loose bricks and stone. But we have heard very recently, that an English nobleman has satisfied the eye, and supplied the building by procuring a similar piece of sculpture to the Caryatids to be substituted.

The temple of Theseus probably furnished the model of the Parthenon.

"It is a most fortunate circumstance," says Mr. Dodwell, "that the Theseion has been converted into a Christian church; if this obstacle had not happily intervened, the whole of the sculpture would now have been in the British Museum; and the world in general, but the Greeks in particular, would have had still more reason to execrate such barbarous Vandalism. Recourse was had to every lure which money could furnish, and to every argument which artifice could suggest, in order to obtain possession of these precious though mutilated relics of ancient art; but every effort proved abortive; and this venerable temple has thus fortunately been saved from utter ruin, and the British name from additional ignominy; for the entire odium of these sacrilegious spoiliations was unjustly thrown upon our government, as it was difficult to conceive that such an indulgence would have been extended to an individual without its powerful intercession." (Dodwell's travels, vol. i. p. 369.)

This elegant building suffered much from the fury of the Iconoclasts, and its figures, though considerably mutilated, are strikingly grand and heroic, and even superior to the metopes of the Parthenon. It is probable that a part of this beautiful sculpture is the production of the painter and sculptor Micon. The figures were originally coloured. On a close inspection, the armour and accessories are found to have been gilt to represent gold or bronze; the drapery is green, blue, or red. The scene took place (Theseus killing a Centaur) in the open air, which is represented by being painted blue. What is singularly striking in the beautiful sculpture of the Centaur, is the gentle assimilation of the human and the animal form, which melt into each by such soft transitions, that the eye is in a manner reconciled to the combination.

In the tower of the Winds, Mr. Dodwell saw a dance called *Semâ*, which is performed there once a week by an order of dancing Derwishes.

"It was," he tells us, "the most horrid and the most ridiculous ceremony that can be imagined! It is extremely difficult for a spectator who has not been accustomed to such singular sights to remain serious; and it would have been dangerous to laugh at their religious ceremonies. The sacred performance is opened by the Derwishes, and as many Turks of all ranks and ages as choose to be of the party; they sit down upon the floor, in a circle, and begin by singing the praises of God and Mohamed, in a slow and solemn manner, repeating very frequently "*Ullah hoo Ullah!*" at the same time moving their heads and bodies backwards and forwards, thus keeping time with the song. The only instrumental accompaniment consisted of two small drums, or hemispheres of bronze, the mouth covered with a skin. The song and the motion of the dancers by degrees become more animated; on a sudden the company all start up, and sing and dance in a circle, with great violence and velocity! When they are tired, they make way for the two principal performers, who, holding each other by the sash which is tied about the waist, turn round with an incredible rapidity, far exceeding any thing I could have supposed the human frame capable of; and which would greatly surprise our most active dancers or posture masters.

"The Sheikh, or chief of the Derwishes, dressed in the sacred colour green, with a large white turban, animates them by his voice; and by the beating of a large tambour, which instrument was also used in ancient festivals, principally in the Bacchanalia, and was called *symphonion*. Mr. Hamilton says, that according to Herodotus and Euripides, this instrument was introduced by Anacharsis from Cynæus into Scythia, where it cost him his life. The larger kind was the *symphonion*; Catullus calls the smaller tambour, *symphonion levis*, and Agnolius *symphonion*." *Hamilton's Travels*.

"The Derwishes continue turning, screaming, and groaning for a considerable length of time, moving their heads violently backwards

and forwards, with their long hair floating in the wind. They at length sink as if exhausted with fatigue, and overcome with giddiness, into the arms of the by-standers, when for a few minutes they are apparently deprived of their reason, and filled with the *ecstasie*, or divine enthusiasm. I have been assured, however, that the force of habit is so great, that this apparent dereliction of the senses is assumed, and not real; which I can easily believe, from a dance of a similar kind which I afterwards saw performed at Rome, by a woman in a show-shop, who turned round with such great velocity for ten minutes together, that the human form was imperceptible to the eye, and appeared like a column turning upon its axis:—

“So whirls a wheel, in giddy circle too,

And rapid as it runs, the single spokes are lost.”

As a proof that her senses were not at the time in the least disordered, she performed several feats of dexterity during her revolutions, such as balancing swords, threading a needle, and playing on the violin with the greatest facility; and after she had finished turning, she showed not the least symptom of fatigue or giddiness; but in a few minutes began to turn again, and performed her task several times in the course of the evening. The faintings and groanings of the Derwishes may therefore be fairly considered as mere religious jugglings! Tavernier observes, that there are Derwishes who turn in this manner for two hours together without stopping, and that their vanity is gratified in the exercise of an occupation, to which we should give the name of folly! (Dodwell's Travels, vol. i. p. 375, 376.)

Mr. Hughes was fortunate in the society of the ingenious Mr. Cockerell, whose science and taste are now well known and justly appreciated.

“Amongst the many observations,” says Mr. Hughes, “made by Mr. Cockerell on the architecture of the Parthenon, I remember one which seemed very delicate and curious: it related to the entasis or swelling of its beautiful and finely proportioned columns. With much difficulty he measured them, and found by a straight line, from the capital to the base, that this swell at about one-third of the height equalled one inch. That in the temple of Jupiter at Ægina measured half an inch, which was in proportion to the other; so that he had no doubt but that there was a general rule on this point with the ancient architects: this protuberance is so delicate, that it must be ascertained by measurement; the eye alone cannot perceive it.” (Hughes's Travels, vol. i. p. 287.)

This is a remarkable fact, and we insert it, because it is wholly new, and had escaped the sagacity of Stuart and all subsequent travellers.

After an excursion to the Piræus in the company of this intelligent artist, and for the particulars of which we must refer the reader to Mr. Hughes's interesting work, he proceeded to the great Stadium beyond the Lissus. In a deep and shaded valley

whose banks are fringed with the *agnus castis*, oleaster, and willow, they found the stream of Ilissus. Its sides are marked by the foundations of buildings. In examining the stadium, which Herodes Atticus coated with Pentelic marble, but of which there is at present no appearance, they observed a small stone pedestal of modern workmanship, at the entrance of a passage cut through the hill leading to the country beyond. They were informed by their guide that it was sometimes used for propitiatory sacrifices. The goddesses, strange as it may seem, were the fates; the worshippers Athenian damsels, who have arrived at the age of matrimonial despair. Early in the morning the parties repair hither, and having offered up their petitions, leave a small frugal repast of eggs, cake, and honey upon the altar, and then depart. Nor is this worship always ineffectual. The priestesses of the altar, anxious for its reputation, descant so forcibly on the good qualities of the despairing nymphs who resort to it, amongst the other sex, that it frequently happens that all cause of complaint is removed. Another singular custom prevails among the lower classes of the Greeks. When a revengeful person has received, or thinks he has received, an injury from his neighbour, he sometimes betakes himself to build up a curse against his adversary in the form of a round barrow or mound of stones, laying some large ones for a foundation, and leaving room for his friends who may take an interest in his cause, to add a pebble to his anathema. He then invokes the fates to heap every ill on the head of the offender, sometimes invoking the arch fiend to his aid. If an accident takes off the devoted victim, the anathematizer is regarded with reverential awe, as a person specially protected by heaven.

Athens has been so copiously illustrated and described, that every spot of the city of Minerva and its vicinity is familiar to the general reader. We cannot, therefore, permit Mr. Dodwell and Mr. Hughes to detain us there any longer. We hasten to topics of greater novelty and variety. Mr. Dodwell tells us, that travelling in *Attica* is secure, and that the utmost hospitality is shown to strangers. He who makes a second tour through the country, can hardly give greater offence to the person, who entertained him in his first visit, than by not again having recourse to him. But in his tour round the *Attic peninsula*, our traveller found the boasted hospitality of the country sometimes forgotten. At the approach of his party to a village called *Brauna*, finding that the villagers had shut up all their fowls when they saw them advancing from a distance, they applied to the *Hegumenos* of a neighbouring convent to supply their wants, who solemnly assured them that not a single fowl was to be found

within twenty miles. At that very moment, however, a treacherous cock betrayed the ecclesiastic, and was immediately answered by all the cocks in the village. This ridiculous circumstance relaxed every countenance but the monk's, who contented himself with uttering an imprecation against the cock and his evil voice, and then furnished them with the requisite supply. Mr. Dodwell found the remains of ancient cities, formerly resounding with the hum of a busy population, now still and tenantless. *Olim urbes, jam tantum nomina!* They had some difficulty in finding their way to the promontory of Sunium. Not even the vestige of a path is to be discovered. This celebrated promontory is one of the finest situations in Greece. Towering in precipitous grandeur from the sea, the prospect from it is rich, various, and magnificent, overlooking the wide expanse of the *Ægean* sea and its islands. By sea, it is about twenty-four miles from the Piræus. On this promontory are the remains of a temple supposed to be that of Minerva. It consists now only of two columns and a pilaster of the *Pronaos*, three on the north, and nine on the south. From the elegance of its proportions, Mr. Dodwell infers that it is a more recent structure than the *Parthenon*. Being exposed to the saline effluvia of the sea, it has been so much corroded, that the angles of the flutings have lost their sharpness. Some metopæ are scattered among the ruins, which form a rich foreground to the temple. Mr. Dodwell thinks that valuable remains might be discovered here by excavations.

Of what *Ægina* once was, the antiquary could expect to find but little remaining. The classical scholar recollects the melancholy and affecting allusion to it, in the well-known letter of *Servius Sulpicius* to *Cicero*, where he numbers it with the carcasses of the many prostrate, but once flourishing cities, which met his eye in his voyage from *Ægina* to *Megara*. It is not to be supposed, that an ancient town which was a mere ruin in the time of *Cicero*, should retain many evidences of its former grandeur. But the beautiful ruin of the temple of the *Panhellenion* Jupiter, the most ancient temple in Greece next to that of *Corinth*, detained Mr. Dodwell some days; during which, with the unwearied ardor of a genuine lover of antiquity, he passed his nights in a cavern. The celebrated statues of *Parian* marble, which are master-pieces of art, and the most precious remains of the *Æginetan* school, were excavated by Mr. Cockerell and some German travellers, from the two extremities of the temple, in 1811. This a discovery, which in its importance to the antiquary, has scarcely been surpassed in modern times. These beautiful fragments, which are supposed to represent the contest with the *Trojans* for the body of *Patroclus*, appear to have fallen from the tympanæ, to which their attitudes are adapted.

"They were evidently made," observes Mr. Dodwell, "prior to the introduction of the beautiful ideal in Grecian sculpture. The muscles and the veins, which are anatomically correct, exhibit the soft flexibility of life; and every motion of the body is in scientific harmony with that of nature. The limbs are strong, though not Herculean; and elegant, without effeminacy; no preposterous muscular protuberance, no unnatural feminine delicacy, offends the eye. They are noble, without being harsh or rigid; and are composed with Doric severity, mingled with the airy grace of youthful forms. The perfection of the finish is quite wonderful; every part is in a style worthy of the most beautiful cameo; the extremities of the hands and feet merit more particular admiration. Indeed the ancients thought that elegant fingers and nails were essential ingredients in the composition of the beautiful. The formation and postures of the bodies afforded a greater scope, and a wider field, for the talent of the sculptor; for while the Doric severity of the early Æginetic school is evidently diffused through the whole, yet a correctness of muscular knowledge, and a strict adherence to natural beauty, are conspicuously blended in every statue. An unmeaning and inanimate smile is prevalent in all the faces. Even one of the heroes, who is mortally wounded, is supporting himself in the most beautiful attitude, and smiling upon death! In short, the conquerors and the conquered, the dying and the dead, have all one expression; or rather none at all. The high finish of their hair is particularly worthy of notice. Some of the curls, which hang down in short ringlets, are of lead, and still remain. The helmets were ornamented with metallic accessories, and the offensive weapons were probably of bronze; but they have not been found.

"All the figures have been painted; the colour is still visible, though nearly effaced. The colour on the ægis of Minerva is very distinguishable. The white marble of which the statues are composed has assumed a yellow hue, from the soil in which they were buried.

"Their broken limbs have been judiciously united at Rome; and some extremities, which were not found in the excavation, have been so well restored and imitated, as to be scarcely distinguishable from the originals. They are destined to render the cabinet of Munich one of the most interesting in the world." (Dodwell, vol. i. pp. 570, 571.)

These exquisite relics were purchased by the Prince Royal of Bavaria, for the inadequate sum of 10,000 Venetian sequins; not a fifth part of their value. They constitute in themselves a cabinet; and we cannot suppress the wish, that a worthier fate had destined them to some British depository.

Of a work so voluminous, and abounding in such minute and elaborate detail, any thing resembling an analysis would be wholly impracticable. We have, therefore, been obliged to satisfy ourselves with presenting to our readers detached portions of it, descriptive of the most memorable places which Mr. Dodwell has included in his valuable survey. We cannot, however, abstain from extracting part of the description of the Vale of Tempe;

a spot which, even unassisted by classical recollections, is another name for picturesque beauty and sublime grandeur of scenery, which are admirably preserved in an elegant drawing engraved by Heath.

"We proceeded along the ancient way, which has been cut with much labour on the steep and rugged side of Ossa. Soon after entering the vale, we came to an aperture in the rock, about three feet in circumference, and close to the right of the road; it is denominated *anemoloma* 'the wind-hole,' from a violent and cold wind which issues from it with a roaring noise. The wind probably proceeds from the communication of the cavity with some subterraneous stream in the bowels of the mountain; several of which streams are seen in different parts of the valley issuing from the rocks, and mixing their lucid waters with the opaque surface of the Peneios. Strabo mentions these subterraneous winds in Boeotia and Eubœa; others of a similar kind exist at Ceci, near Terni, in Italy. A short way further we came to a clear and cold spring, gushing with impetuosity from beneath the roots of a large platanus: it immediately enters the Peneios, from whose dusky current its limpid waters may long be discriminated. As far as this spot the vale is of narrow and contracted dimensions; but here it is enlarged into a greater expanse. The trees which are scattered at the foot of Olympus suffer the eye to glance with delight on intervening glades of lively verdure, which are vividly contrasted with the sterile rocks and dark precipices that form the prominent features of the vale. The banks of the river are in many places embowered by platani of such ample growth, that while they lave their pendant branches in the stream, they form so dense a screen as almost entirely to exclude the rays of the sun. The wild olive, the laurel, the oleander, the agnos, various kinds of arbuti, the yellow jasmine, terebinth, lentiscus, and rosemary, with the myrtle and liburnum, richly decorate the margin of the river, while masses of aromatic plants and flowers exhale their varied perfumes and breathe their luscious odours through the scented air. A multiplicity of oaks, of firs, and of other forest trees, are seen flourishing in a higher region of the mountains. The vale, as if by some giant-pressure, is again reduced to a narrow glen, and, in some parts, no more space is left than is sufficient for the current of the river, above which Ossa and Olympus shoot up in precipices of almost perpendicular ascent. The grandest rock that I ever beheld is nearly in the middle of the valley, where it raises its gigantic form into the air, impressing the beholder with surprise and wonder. Its aspiring summit is crowned by the remains of an ancient fortress, of Roman construction: a marble cornice, which had fallen from the ruins, was lying in the road. Having proceeded some way from this spot, we arrived at the narrowest part of the valley, where Ossa and Olympus are only separated by the Peneios. The ancient road is here judiciously cut in the rock; and as it mounts, resting places for the horses feet have been dexterously contrived in the surface of the stone, which would otherwise be slippery, and expose the traveller to the danger of being precipitated into the river. The rock has also been worn by the

ancient marks of wheels; and there is just room for two carriages to pass with ease, as the breadth occupied by the carriages of the ancients was about five feet, and that of the road thirteen feet. This was formerly one of the fortified parts of the valley, as is evident by the inscription which is cut in the face of a rock, rising from the right hand side of the way.

L. CASSIUS LONGIN
PROCOS
TEMPE MVNIVIT.

"Longinus was sent into Thessaly by Julius Cæsar. It is likely that he repaired the forts of Tempe, which were in a dilapidated state. The other parts of the slab, on which is the proconsular inscription, are almost covered with Greek characters, which are generally in small letters. These appear to be proper names, perhaps those of the officers who accompanied Longinus; they may even have been made by travellers, who have rested at this spot. They can only be discovered by a very close inspection, and, having been originally slightly scratched on the stone, are at present too imperfect to be intelligible. Below this place, a rivulet issues from the rock, and is so extremely clear, that, for a considerable way, it disdains to mingle its blue stream with the silvery and muddy waters of the Peneios; but seems to glide over it like oil, until it is gradually induced to assimilate its waters with those of the more potent stream." (Dodwell, vol. ii. p. 111—114.)

The ruins of Sparta afforded but a scanty recompense to Mr. Dodwell's labours. *Ipsæ periére ruinæ.* He was accompanied to that memorable place by Demetrio Manusaki, a respectable Greek; at whose house he was hospitably entertained; and finding several imperfect inscriptions, took copies of them. When Mr. Dodwell had finished his task, he was not a little surprised at observing his friend, the Greek, turning over the stones, and concealing them under bushes. In answer to the natural inquiry why he did so, he replied that he did it in order to preserve them, because many years ago a French *milordos*, who visited Sparta, after having copied a great number of inscriptions, had the letters chisselled out and defaced: and Mr. Dodwell saw some fine slabs of marble, whose inscriptions had been thus barbarously erased. This it seems, and the fact would be incredible if it did not rest on undeniable proof, was one of the operations of the Abbé Fourmont, who travelled in 1729 through Greece, by order of Louis XV.: and his object evidently was, that he might be enabled to blend truth and falsehood without detection, and publish forgeries and impostures, without contradiction. This modern Alaric himself boasted of the unsparing havoc he had made, of the most venerable records of ancient history. To such an extent had he carried on his devastations, that we are disposed to be incredulous of his own report of his own villainy. His ostentatious avowal, however, of his demolitions are on record in his

letters, (now in the King's library at ———, and addressed from different parts of Greece to the Count de Maurepas, M. Freret, and others. "Je l'ai fait," says this unblushing Iconoclast, "non pas raser, mais abattre de fond en comble. Depuis plus de trente jours, trente et quelquefois quarante ou soixante ouvriers, abattent, détruisent, exterminent la ville de Sparte," &c. &c. "Dans le moment que je suis occupé à la dernière destruction de Sparte," &c. "Si en renversant ses murs, et ses temples, si en ne laissant pas une pierre sur une autre au plus petits de ses sacellums, son lieu sera dans la suite ignoré, j'ai au moins de quoi la faire reconnaître, et c'est quelque chose, *je n'avois que ce moyen là pour rendre illustre mon voyage,*" &c. These letters, which indicate the stupid vanity as much as the wanton wickedness of this infamous Frenchman, are not generally known. We have, therefore, felt some pleasure in contributing to hold him forth to contempt and indignation; not that there is any danger from the contagion of his example. His name will hereafter be associated not with Greece, whose soil he polluted, but with the most barbarous foes of taste and literature, by whom she has been ravaged.

We return with great pleasure to the entertaining journey of Mr. Hughes; and forbearing to follow him over those tracks, in which so many travellers have trodden before him, we shall confine ourselves to that part of his work which abounds with newer and more curious details; and which, in our opinion, is the best and most interesting account of that part of Greece, whose destinies are swayed by a man, in his genius and fortunes one of the most extraordinary characters of modern times. It is of Ali Pasha that we speak. A residence of some duration at his capital, during which he had several opportunities of personal intercourse with that able chieftain, enabled Mr. Hughes to penetrate the mysteries of his policy, and to examine the shades of his disposition. On their way to Ioannina, Mr. Hughes and his party were perpetually assailed by relations of his horrible cruelties. His name, at Santa Maura, was made use of to frighten children.

—EXETON βασιλῆα, βροτῶν δηλῆμονα πάντων.

But at Prevesa, not long since a flourishing and populous city, and forming a part of the Ionian state, they found sad and melancholy memorials of his power. Since its capture by the Venetians in 1684, it had remained under Christian government, till the late convulsions of Europe, when it fell into the hands of Ali Pasha, who had defeated the French garrison. Before this unfortunate change of masters, Prevesa contained a population of 16,000 souls. It abounded with handsome churches, convents, and squares. Its climate is delicious, and it is blessed with a soil

incomparably fertile. The fisheries were the finest in the Ionian sea, the olive groves and vineyards that surrounded the town were the envy of its neighbours, and the harbour was completely safe and sheltered. A deplorable change has been effected, and she is now an affecting monument of the worst inflictions of arbitrary power. Her wretched population reduced to about 3000, stalk like spectres through its vacant and deserted streets. The houses and all the churches rased to the ground; the greater part of the inhabitants occupying wretched huts composed of hurdles, in the suburbs—such is the fallen state of Prevesa.

"A few of the old inhabitants," says Mr. Hughes, "still retain a part of their former possessions: but the number of these decreases daily. The tears trickled down the cheeks of our venerable host whilst he recounted to us the series of his misfortunes. A little before our arrival 300 fine trees, the last remnant of his olive-grounds, had been taken from him and given to an Albanian officer in the pasha's service. He had been obliged to pay annually a contribution of 3000 piasters, nor did he expect that a single para of this exaction would be remitted, though the means of furnishing it were thus taken away. A lingering death by famine in the streets, as hundreds of his fellow-citizens had perished, seemed to await the poor old gentleman and his aged wife. To our inquiries why he did not sell the little of his property that was left and emigrate, he answered, that by having remained in Prevesa since its occupation by the pasha, seduced by his deceitful promises, he had made himself his subject, and that such an one cannot leave the country without permission and giving sureties for his return: that no person can purchase his property, and the very proposal would be attended with confiscation and perpetual imprisonment. Notwithstanding his systematic oppression and continual demolition of Prevesa, it is a very favourite residence of the pasha, his great naval depot, fortified by the strongest works and adorned by the finest palace in his dominions. Neither the casual observer nor the unfortunate victims of his despotism, can reconcile this apparent contradiction, or develop the motives of what seems to be such tyrannical caprice: to estimate these it is necessary to be acquainted with the history of this extraordinary man." (Hughes, vol. i. pp. 410, 411.)

From Prevesa it is an hour's ride to the ruins of Nicopolis, founded by Augustus in memory of the naval fight at Actium, which made him master of the world. Nothing could have been more beautiful than the site of this city, whose fortune it was not to rise into grandeur from humble beginnings, but to start into magnificence at the first moment of its existence. A fine isthmus formed by the bay of Comarus on the west, and a curve of the Ambracian gulph on the east, vine-clad hills sheltering it from the north, a full view of the Ionian sea and its clustering islands on the south, formed the superb situation where it was founded. The

spot was precisely that on which Augustus had encamped his army. It was soon colonised from various towns in Epirus and Peloponesus. The most interesting object is the ruin of a large theatre, capable of containing at least 20,000 spectators. The building, though Roman, is excavated in the Grecian method on the side of a hill, which not being of a height sufficient for the size contemplated, that part of the external circumference which supported the upper gallery or portico, is built of large blocks, perforated with square holes for the poles which supported the awning. The scene is quite entire; a laterital structure with three arched entrances, one in the centre, the other at equal distances. On each side of the proscenium or stage, which is 116 feet in breadth, and 28 only in depth, is a large square apartment, probably used as a place for the machinery. The interior of the acropolis contains ruins of temples, baths, and other edifices, to which no name can be with certainty assigned. It is a melancholy reflection, that the Pasha has committed dreadful havoc amidst these interesting remains; and that he has been carrying on excavations on the spot of some superb temple, whence marble shafts and beautiful entablatures were carried off without compunction, to be worked up in his fort and serai at Prevesa. His excavators have very recently dug up a fine bust of Trajan, which now decorates one of the rooms of his Prevesan scraglio. Thus in the endless and capricious mutabilities of human affairs, the splendid memorials of the glory of Augustus serve at last to decorate the dwelling of an Albanian robber! These are melancholy contemplations, but humanity is wounded by the thought that during the construction of this scraglio, thousands of miserable peasants from Prevesa and its vicinity, were obliged to perform all the heavy work without any other pay, than a few rations of coarse bread, and the casual gift of a few paras.

After sailing across the enchanting gulph of Ambracia, they landed at Salagora; and the next day proceeded to Arta (the ancient Ambracia), which is about four hours distant, and thence proceeded by a gradual descent into the plains of Ioannina. At two miles distance, the city makes a noble appearance, stretching along the shore of its magnificent lake, and crowned with palaces and mosques. The grand serai of Ali Pasha and those of his two sons are in the best style of Turkish architecture, and burst on the sight with great magnificence, having a noble expanse of water and a range of snow-capt mountains combining with it, in the formation of the landscape. The interior of the city, however, does not correspond with its external appearance; being like other Turkish towns composed of narrow streets, and of houses which not being built for external show present only bare walls towards the street. Still, however, Ioannina displayed

more neatness and stability than any other Greek town which Mr. Hughes had visited. The house of Signore Nicolo Argyri had been expressly ordered by the Vizir for their reception. The history of their unfortunate host is melancholy and interesting. His father Anastasio Argyri Bretto, a person of very amiable qualities, had amassed vast wealth by commerce. When he walked the streets, the children flocked round him to kiss his hand; and at his death, the whole city attended his funeral, to pay the last tribute of respect to its munificent benefactor. He was moreover the bosom friend of the Pasha. A few days after his interment, this crafty chieftain called Nicolo into his presence under the pretext of condoling with him; but at the end of the conference, introduced the subject of his father's will, hinting that his old friend had remembered him in it, since he understood that he had left him all his lands and gardens in the vicinity of Arta. Poor Nicolo, thunder-struck at thus losing the best part of his inheritance, ventured to observe that he had not seen such an item in the will, although he had certainly bequeathed to his Highness a diamond ring of great value. At these words, the Vizir's countenance was inflamed with anger. He declared with a countenance of great fury, that a son who was thus negligent of the last wishes of a parent, was not fit to live. Nicolo, who set a greater value on his head than on his lands, gladly appeased the wrath of this execrable tyrant, and besought him to accept the estate in addition to the ring, since the intention of his father was now perfectly clear. This, however, was only the first of Nicolo's misfortunes. The Vizir soon stripped him of his remaining property. In this miserable state Mr. Hughes found him, living in a large house, with a revenue scarcely adequate to the support of a cottage. We must give Mr. Hughes's visit to Ali Pasha in his own words.

"At about four o'clock Mr. Foresti, accompanied by Colonel Church, called at our lodging, and we all proceeded together to the new Serai of Litaritza, as it is called, an immense pile of building, constructed in a very curious and picturesque manner, of wood painted in various colours, and rising as it were out of a strong fortress which forms the basement story, whose cannon in its embrasures seem to frown over the town below—the picture of a tyrant entrenched among his slaves!

"Having passed through the outer gates of the great court we found it crowded with a numerous retinue of Albanian guards, loitering about or seated on the ground and smoking pipes; intermingled with these, agas and beys might be distinguished by jackets embroidered till they were as stiff as coats of mail, tatars by the lofty bonnet, dervishes by the sugar-loaf cap, chaoushes by their golden knobbed sticks, and here and there a poor petitioner by his supplicating looks and dejected air, unable perhaps to see the proud menial who denied him access to

his master. At the second gate, which leads into an inner area, is a small room on the left hand side where the pasha now sat listening to petitions and deciding causes, in the gate, being supreme over all both ecclesiastical and civil in his dominions. Indeed he very much simplifies judicial proceedings, and cuts very short the quirks and quibbles of the law, setting archons, muftis, cadis, and every other officer at defiance; his will is the only statute book, and the sole precedents to which he appeals are the dictates of his own caprice: in criminal matters, that admirable maxim of British jurisprudence, which tends to prevent the execution of one innocent man, though nine guilty should escape, is here totally reversed,—hang ten provided you secure the offender. We entered the palace through a mean kind of hall, which is turned into a coach-house, or place de remise for a large unwieldy German carriage. From this place we ascended a flight of narrow slippery stone steps, into the habitable part of the seraglio, which is upon the first floor. Passing through a large room at least one hundred and fifty feet in length, which is appropriated to the retinue of the court, we were ushered into a very fine saloon, well furnished and profusely adorned with gilding and carved wood: the floor was covered with a rich Persian carpet of immense size, the sofas of the divan were of the best Cyprus velvet fringed with gold, and the windows, formed of the largest plate-glass, brought into view the fine expanse of the lake with its very magnificent mountain scenery. We waited in this room about half an hour, during which time we were subjected to the inspection of nearly all the officers, slaves, and eunuchs of the palace; amongst the rest one Seid Achmet Effendi, a man of dark colour, who had been sent by the pasha upon a mission to London, accosted us with great familiarity, and seemed so ambitious of displaying his extraordinary attainments before his companions by conversing with the Milordi in their own language, that he repeated to us the few sentences of English with which he was acquainted full fifty times.

“At length a chaoush came to announce that his highness was ready to receive us; and we descended down the great staircase, impatient to view this extraordinary character, the representative of a sovereign more puissant than his master, a man less than a king, yet greater. As we approached the audience chamber, I felt my heart palpitate at the thought of entering into the presence of a being who had long held so dire a sway over the destinies of his fellow mortals, and whose steps in his dark career were marked indelibly by the stain of blood! At the entrance of his apartment stood several Albanian guards, one of whom opened the door, and we marched into the room saluting the vizir as we entered, who sat upon a lion’s skin at an angle of the divan, handsomely but not superbly dressed, a band of gold lace which bound the scarlet cap upon his head, a broad belt of the same material which passed round his waist, and the pom-pom of his handjar glittering with diamonds, alone denoted the man of exalted rank: a houka stood near him which he is rather fond of exhibiting, as the use of it shews a considerable strength of lungs. As soon as we were seated upon the divan he returned our salutation, by placing his right hand upon his breast with a gentle inclination of his head, and expressed his satisfac-

tion at seeing us in his capital. He then asked if we spoke Romain. Colonel Church, though an excellent linguist, for political reasons pretended total ignorance of the language; Mr. Cockerell, from his intimate acquaintance with the manners of the Turks who admire reserve in youth, dissimulated his true knowledge, whilst Mr. Parker and myself confessed an ignorance which our short residence in Greece had not yet enabled us to overcome: but at this moment I made a firm determination that I would use all possible diligence in acquiring so necessary a vehicle of communication with this interesting personage. In the present instance Mr. Foresti acted as interpreter general. At a first introduction it could not be expected that we should acquire much insight into the character of the pasha: my own attention was directed chiefly to the contemplation of his countenance; and this is in general no index of his mind. Here it is very difficult to find any traces of that bloodthirsty disposition, that ferocious appetite for revenge, that restless and inordinate ambition, that inexplicable cunning, which has marked his eventful career: the mien of his face on the contrary has an air of mildness in it, his front is open, his venerable white beard descending over his breast gives him a kind of patriarchal appearance, whilst the silvery tones of his voice, and the familiar simplicity with which he addresses his attendants, strongly aid the deception.

“ Still after very attentive consideration, I thought I could perceive certain indications of cruelty and perfidy beneath his grey eyebrows, with marks of deep craftiness and policy in the lineaments of his forehead; there was something sarcastic in his smile, and even terrible in his laugh. His address was engaging, his figure very corpulent, although it is said to have been graceful in his youth; as his stature is rather below the middle size, and his waist long in proportion, he appears to greatest advantage as we now saw him seated on the divan, or on horseback.

“ Soon after our entrance some young boys dressed in rich garments, with their fine hair flowing over their shoulders, presented us with pipes, whose amber heads were ornamented with jewels: others brought us coffee in small china cups with golden soucups. Our conversation was very desultory. The vizir paid many handsome compliments to our country, assuring us that he should always feel happy whilst his territories afforded objects of curiosity and interest to his English friends. We assured him in return, that the theatre of his exploits would long continue to attract the regards, not only of the English but all other nations. He seemed pleased at the compliment, inquired with much apparent interest respecting Lord Byron and Mr. Hobhouse, asked us how long we had left Athens, whether any discoveries had been made there lately by excavations, and mentioned the pleasure which his son Vely Pasha had received by his visit to that beautiful city. He then turned to Colonel Church with an air of the greatest affability, for whatever displeasure he may feel internally he can mask it by the most complete veil of hypocrisy, and expressed his hopes that he would stay at least a month with him in Ioannina: this invitation was politely declined under plea of military orders, which obliged the colonel to leave Albania next day: upon this the vizir requested another conference

with him in the morning before his departure, and addressing himself to us said he hoped he should see us frequently, adding in the true style of oriental hyperbole, that his palace and all he possessed must be considered as our own. The conference was now broken up and we departed." (Hughes, vol. i. p. 443—444.)

It was impossible for any British traveller, desirous of an intercourse with this extraordinary man, to have visited his capital under more favourable circumstances. Ali had a great appetite for some of the Ionian islands, and would have ceded half his possessions for Corfu, which would have rendered him independent of the Porte. Having during the war rendered some services to his British allies, he was constantly expecting an insular dependency as a recompense, and on this account, was extremely civil to every English subject who happened to be in his dominions. Between the castron (a part of the town comprehending the old seraglio, and inhabited only by Turks and Jews,) and the bazar, is a small area, wherein is the city guard-house. This spot is the scene of the most cruel punishments, when the Vizir thinks proper to make an example. Nature is sickened, when we learn that criminals have been here roasted alive over a slow fire, impaled and skinned. Some of the most respectable inhabitants of Ioannina assured Mr. Hughes, who lent an unwilling credit to the account, that they had actually been entreated by these wretched victims at the stake for water, which they were prevented from giving them by fear of a similar fate themselves.

Ioannina contains many handsome houses, some of them furnished in so profuse a style as to hasten the downfall of their masters. An instance of this kind is mentioned by Mr. Hughes. The Vizir deprived Anastasi, the richest Greek merchant and the best man in his dominions, of a magnificent house, because he wished for it as a residence for his nephew, having banished the poor proprietor, his wife, and a large family to the arid rock of Argyro Castro, where Mr. Hughes saw him a few months afterwards, actually dying of a fever brought on by his distresses. The city is about two miles long, and one in breadth, and contains about 6000 hearths.* Few persons walk about the streets. Now and then Mr. Hughes saw an archondissa or great lady going to pay a visit, followed by her maid servants with her best dresses, according to ancient usage. Women only of the lower class mix indiscriminately in the streets. They visited Mouchtar Pasha, Ali's eldest son, a youth with all his father's vices, unmitigated by any of his better qualities. Some of the ornamental devices of his serai, will give a just idea of his dispo-

* Neither Mahometan nor Christian keeps a register. Mr. Hobhouse states the uses at about 8000, and the whole number of inhabitants at about 35,000; and 20,000 is assigned in the table annexed to Palmer's map.

sition. One of them represents the Vizir surrounded by his troops, witnessing the execution of two Greeks whom the hangman is tying to a gibbet; others exhibit decapitated trunks with the blood flowing. Ali Pasha has a beautiful kiosk or pavilion in the midst of extensive gardens, and hither he often retires from the fatigues of business, without removing too far from the capital; and in a small room in the garden frequently pays his troops, or administers what is called justice. He has not indeed less than thirty of these little tenements, in and about Ioannina; and as he selects a different place every day, it is never known exactly where he is to be found; and this not from fear, for no one exposes himself more openly. His very confidence, in fact, seems to be his protection: the people seem to fancy he bears a charmed life.

According to the usual custom of this country, if a man dies without an heir male, his property goes to the Vizir, and his widow and daughters may be turned into the streets. A poor woman, who kept M. Ponqueville's house (the French consul), found herself with a young daughter in this desolate state, and the corpse had scarcely been consigned to the grave, when Ali's agents seized on her property, and turned her out with her child to starve. They fled to M. Ponqueville, who gave them protection for the night; and the next morning, procured their house for his own consular dwelling, and continued to reside with the owners as their lodger. Our own resident, Mr. G. Foresti, was distinguished by his sympathy with his afflicted countrymen, for this worthy man is a Greek by birth. An instance of his benevolence is recorded by Mr. Hughes, which we cannot with justice omit. To keep up fear and subjection amongst his subjects, Ali not unfrequently amuses himself by throwing down to the lowest misery some prosperous and rising person, more especially if he has risen with the tyrant's assistance. Michael Michelachi, descended from one of the best families in Albania, was left while yet an infant, by his father, who had been one of the Vizir's most faithful friends, under the guardianship of his sovereign. Ali took the greatest care of his ward, gave him the best education, when he was of age restored him all his property, betrothed him to a rich heiress, and made him primate of the city, a post in which Michael gained the general esteem of Turks and of Greeks. But the tyrant was at length pleased to execute his favourite policy; and having suborned a set of false witnesses, who swore that Michael was in possession of the property, which the widow of Ali's predecessor had secreted at her husband's death, he was confronted with these perjured villains; and their depositions being shown to him, he was ordered to surrender the treasure on pain of death. The result was, that he was carried to the *buldrun*,

a damp and gloomy dungeon, where he was chained to the ground. In the meanwhile his house was sifted, and terror and despair, so generally was he beloved, seized the inhabitants of Ioannina, some of whom went to the serai to intercede with the Vizir in his behalf; but he would not be approached, and saw no one that day. Mr. Foresti had returned to the city late on that evening, and found at his house a deputation of the chief Greeks, to inform him of what had happened to poor Michelachi. That night nothing could be done, but the next morning he rose with the sun, and made his appearance at the serai. Having sent in his name, Mr. Foresti was immediately admitted to the Vizir, and entered upon a conversation, knowing with whom he had to deal, on subjects wholly indifferent. At last he casually remarked, "I see a vast number of people about the serai, and the city is in an uproar. No one could tell the cause, till my cook informed me that you had put to death my friend Michelachi. As I know him to be an excellent man, I have to thank your highness for not committing this act while the dragoman was here, who might have spread very disgraceful news about us in Constantinople." (V.) In a quick tone, "Ah! but I have not killed him; he is alive at present. But he has cruelly deceived me, *παιδί μου* (my son:) my heart burns within me: if you could see it, it would appear this moment in a flame! A man whom I have brought up from his infancy to use me thus!" (F.) "Indeed! But has any opportunity been given him to prove his innocence; and who are his accusers?" Here Ali Pasha adverted to the number of the witnesses, and the solemnity of their attestations. (F.) "That may be, but can you believe their oaths against the word of such a man as you know Michelachi to be? What will they say at the Porte, and what will any government say, when they hear that you have put to death, or ruined one of your best friends on such evidence?" (V.) "But *παιδί μου* what can I now do, implicated as I am?" (F.) "Why order an examination instantly to be set on foot." (V.) "Will you take it into your own hands?" (F.) "To be sure I will for your sake, as well as Michael's." Having gained this point, Mr. Foresti had little more to do. Having with the two primates of the city comforted the poor man's wife and children, and for form's sake searched the house for the imaginary treasure, they interrogated Michael and the witnesses, who were unable to substantiate any part of their charge. They then reported to the Vizir Michael's innocence. The tyrant then pretended to fall into a passion with the witnesses, and declared that they should suffer the cruellest of deaths, a sentence which would have been instantly executed, had it not been for the intercession of Mr. Foresti, and of Michael himself. Ali restored Michelachi again into favour, and often thanked Mr. Foresti

for saving him from the disgrace of putting an innocent man to death.

The second volume of Mr. Hughes's work is chiefly occupied by an elaborate biography of Ali Pasha, preceded by a slight sketch of the history of his capital. But the cursory manner in which it has heretofore been noticed by travellers, the very slender historical documents which it furnishes, and the space which it is beginning to occupy in the public mind, as the most rising and prosperous city of European Turkey, confer no inconsiderable value on our author's researches. After an elaborate view of the different nations who have inhabited Epirus, from the conquest of Pyrrhus by the Romans to the present time, he enters into some ingenious historical conjectures, for authentic history is silent upon the subject, concerning the origin of Ioannina. There can be no doubt, however, that it was occupied in the early ages of the Byzantine empire. The first mention of it is by Anna Comnena, in the eleventh century. But during the dark ages it is wholly unnoticed, till the capture of Constantinople by the Franks, when it is mentioned as a fortress in the great despotate of Epirus. During the government of Thomas, the son-in-law of Simon, the despot of Ætolia and Acarnania, in 1368, a terrible pestilence invaded Ioannina. Much obscurity intervenes till it fell under the Turkish dominion. After this event, the Mahometan population of course increased. But the Greeks still retained the city, or castron, on condition of a moderate tribute. At length, in 1611, one Dionysius, called the dog-sophist, (Σκηλοσοφος,) formerly Bishop of Triccala, but ejected for practising the arts of astrology and magic, having dreamed that he was fated to deliver his country from the Ottoman yoke, roamed about the country with a wallet at his back, and a flaggon of wine by his side, gaining proselytes to his cause. Arriving at the monastery of San Demetrio, about ten hours from Ioannina, and understanding that the Turks were less numerous there than elsewhere, he determined to begin his operations in this city. Having collected a crowd of followers, he led them by night against the town, put to death about an hundred Mahometans, and burned several houses; Asuman Pasha, the governor, escaping with great difficulty. The result, however, was, that the Turks at last rallied, charged the rebels, whom they slew without mercy, and took many prisoners. Dionysius escaped in the tumult, and hid himself in a cave, which to this day is called the cave of the Skelosophist. Being soon discovered, he was flayed alive, his skin stuffed with straw, and sent as a present to the Seraglio at Constantinople.

After this rebellion Ioannina was treated by the Turks like other conquered cities. Having, as a matter of course, impaled,

burnt alive, and sawed asunder some of the conspirators, all Christians, by a firman of the Sultan, were banished from the castron. In consequence of this expulsion of the Greek population from the castron, the city began to extend itself along the banks of the lake. It was governed by boys and pashaws of two tails, sent by the Porte; but it never was the head or capital of a sandgiac till the time of its present sovereign, whose experienced eye instantly saw the advantages of its central position; and having from that time resolved to make it the focus of his dominion, it has, under him, arisen to its present splendour and importance.

Our author is to be commended for the successful diligence with which he has collected the principal events of the life of Ali. We regret that we cannot present our readers even with an abstract of this piece of biography. The most prominent features, however, of the vizir's adventures ought not to be altogether unnoticed. He was born at Tepeleni about the year 1750; his father was a pasha of two tails, who, having been appointed to the pashalic of Delvino, but being removed by the intrigues of the Seraglio, died, it is said, of grief, leaving two wives and three children. Ali obtained his father's property, through his intriguing and ferocious mother, who soon got rid of her rival and her child. This woman however was, with her daughter, captured by the inhabitants of Gardiki, and subjected to the brutal passions of the victors; but they were at length rescued and carried back to Tepeleni. Vengeance on the Gardikiotes was breathed into Ali by the dying voice of his mother, and fanned into a flame by the cruel and sanguinary Shainitza, his sister. "After a lapse of forty years," says our traveller, "the vengeance of these furies was executed to the full, by Ali's stern decree—the guilty but unfortunate Gardiki is no more, and Shainitza's * head reclines upon the raven tresses of its daughters." (Hughes, vol. ii. p. 104.) Having casually discovered a treasure in a ruined monastery, he carried on for some time, but with various fortune, a series of hostilities with the enemies of his house, and their confederate tribes. Not long afterwards he pursued a new path of adventure, and became a leader of banditti till he was taken by the Pasha of Berat, from whom, however, he was dismissed with presents of great value, having signaled himself by serving with his troops at the head of his own faithful Albanians. He resumed his former occupation, in the exercise of which he fell into the hands of the Pasha of Ioannina, who, though strongly urged by his own beys and the governors of

* She said that she should never know peace of mind till she had stuffed her couch with the hair of the Gardikiote women.

neighbouring districts, to consign the young robber to death, not only permitted his prisoner to live, but supplied him with the means of carrying on his predatory operations. These he employed in embodying a large band of freebooters. The substance and sum of this eventful history, which Mr. Hughes has delineated with great spirit and eloquence, is, that by gradual advances, though with perpetual vicissitudes of fortune, he accumulated sufficient wealth to purchase a small pashalick; and then, by war, perfidy, and bloodshed, obtained post after post in Albania, till having destroyed all his enemies and rivals, he secured, by the imperial firman, the pashalick of Ioannina,—of which, by the exertion of great courage and perseverance, he had already made himself master. But the whole of his ascent to the heights of his present power is one unvaried course of slaughter and devastation. Towns rased to the ground, their wretched inhabitants massacred, cold-blooded assassinations, render his eventful history almost monotonous in crime and misery. We cannot forbear giving a short account of the Suliot republic, from our traveller's most interesting history of its struggles and its fall.

“ Whilst Ali was extending the limits of his sway towards the north, the southern districts of his dominions were subjected to the incursions of a clan, contemptible to all appearance for their numbers, but impregnable in their mountain-holds, and capable, by their daring courage and enthusiastic love of liberty, of attacking him in his capital, and alarming him in the very recesses of his harem. These were the Suliots: a people which sustained the character of ancient Greece, and assumed the spirit of its independent sons. Their abode was like the dwelling of a race of genii, upon a kind of natural citadel, amidst the wild Cassopæan mountains, where the Acheron rolls down a dark and truly infernal chasm, overhung with rocks and woods of deepest gloom. The high peaks of precipices bounding this mysterious glen were surmounted by fortified towers, whilst the paths leading to the impending heights above scarcely admitted two persons to walk abreast. During the worst eras of Grecian slavery, the flame burned bright upon this hill-altar of liberty, and its worshippers breathing a purer air, and excited as it were by those stupendous energies of nature which they constantly had in view, preserved their physical and moral strength unimpaired, not only defying tyranny, but pouring down from their rocky fastnesses over the plains of the oppressor, and carrying off that booty which was considered as their lawful property. At Suli the rebellion was planned, under Lambro Canziani, to liberate Greece from the Ottoman yoke, and the conspirators had their headquarters in these impregnable fastnesses.

“ Four large villages constituted the principal seats of this independent clan, in a situation so singular, as probably to be unique. They lay upon a fine concave plain at the perpendicular height of

about 2000 feet above the bed of the Acheron; a grand natural breast-work descended precipitously to the river; whilst behind them rose a towering chain of mountains, at once an ornament and defence. The Acheron, after passing through the valley of Dervitziana, first enters the Suliot chasm, where it is called the Gorge of Skœutias, from a small village of that name: a narrow path, which winds amidst the darkest woods upon the right bank, conducts the traveller in about two hours to a narrow cut across his path, called Klissura, admirably calculated to stop the progress of an enemy. This defile was commanded by a fort called Tichos, and near it was the first village of the Suliot republic, called Navarico or Avarico. From hence a gradual ascent leads to the deserted site of Samoniva; thence to Kiaffa, signifying a height, and lastly to Suli, the capital of the tribe, which was generally styled Kako-Suli, like the *Κακοίλιον* of Homer, from the difficulties it opposed to a conqueror. Near the spot where the mountain-path leaves the side of the Acheron, to wind up the precipices between Kiaffa and Kako-Suli, a conical hill overhangs the road, called Kunghi, on which stood the largest of the Suliot fortresses, named Aghia Paraskevi, or Saint Friday. At the same spot another small river, flowing from the Paramithian mountains, joins the Acheron, which, descending down the romantic defile of Glyki, enters the great Paramithian plain, and empties itself, after flowing through the Acherusian lake, into the Ionian sea, near the ancient city of Cichyrus or Ephyre.

“Such was the situation of the Suliot republic.” (Hughes’s *Travels*, vol. ii. p. 122, 123.)

The struggles of this brave but unfortunate people, carried on through various alternations of fortune for a considerable time, present a wild and romantic picture of virtuous and patriotic independence, not often to be found in the history of more civilized states. Their plan of warfare was the ancient one, of sudden skirmishes, daring expeditions, frequent attacks, and quick retreats. Their women shared in the perils of the field. Ali soon found that the destruction of this republic, seated in the strongest hold of Epirus, was necessary to his schemes. In 1792 he attacked them with an army of 10,000 men; but the Turks received such a check at the pass of Klissura, that the passage was nearly choked with their dead bodies, having been exposed to the dreadful musquetry of the Suliotes, from the fort which commanded it. The pass of Thermopylæ was not more bravely defended. Scarcely a thousand men returned. Ali gave up the conquest as hopeless, and made peace with the republic. A second expedition, some years afterwards, at the head of 18,000 men, was not more successful. Despairing to conquer Suli by assault, he at last determined to proceed after the method of blockade.

“After a year’s siege their condition became so lamentable that they were obliged to live upon acorns, herbs, and roots, and to grind and

mix up the bark of trees with a very scanty proportion of meal; yet under all these calamities their enemies could gain no advantage over them when they came to engage in conflict. In their extreme distress the following is one of the manœuvres which they executed to obtain supplies.

“Four hundred of their bravest palikars, with 170 female heroines, headed by Moson, sallied out by night, escaped under cover of the darkness through the defile of Glyky, and arrived in safety at Parga. There they were joyfully received by the compassionate inhabitants, fed for the space of four days, and on the fifth dismissed with as much provision as they could carry for their famished countrymen. One hundred of this troop, with lighter burdens, marched as an advanced guard, to protect the convoy; next came the women in the centre, and then the rest of the men, each carrying as much as he could possibly support. The Albanians, to the number of more than a thousand, endeavoured to intercept their return, but either through fear of the men, or from that respect towards the women which is carried in this country to such an excess that the soldiers sometimes fire from behind them without fear of a return, they refrained from attacking the party; its arrival was most welcome to the Suliots, reduced as they were almost to skeletons, through famine: yet even in this extremity their constant cry was liberty or death.” (*Hughes’s Travels*, vol. ii. p. 159, 160.)

In 1803 the Suliots made their last attempt against their besiegers, by a daring attack on Villa, a strong fortress held by the Albanians, and the principal magazine of their army. Having sent out, in a dark and windy night, 200 picked men, and a hole having been dug under a corner tower, in which they had deposited a barrel of gunpowder, the men set up a prodigious shout, which having brought the garrison to the supposed place of attack, an explosion took place which completely overwhelmed them in the ruins of the angle. This however was the last action of any consequence performed by this resolute people. An overwhelming force was sent against them; and, after prodigies of valour, and examples of individual heroism, which equalled the most boasted instances of patriotic devotion in the records of ancient days, the poor Suliots were so worn down by war and famine, that they accepted a capitulation; yet such was the terror of their name, that they were suffered to depart from the place in order to settle where they pleased.

“And now follow the most bloody and perfidious scenes in the catastrophe of this tragic history. Men, women, and children being gathered together, they were separated into two bodies, the largest of which under the conduct of Tzavella and Dimo Draco bent their steps towards Parga, whilst the other marched in the direction of Prevesa with the intention of embarking for Santa Maura. Both were attacked on their road by the troops of the perfidious tyrant. The first men-

tioned corps having formed a hollow square, and placed their wives, children, and cattle in the midst, gallantly fought their way through the enemy and effected their retreat. The other party were not equally fortunate. Being overtaken by their pursuers at the monastery of Zalongo, they entrenched themselves in its court and prepared for a stout defence: so many troops however were brought against them that the gates of the monastery were soon forced, and an indiscriminate slaughter commenced; those that could escape took the road to Arta, but a party of about 100 women and children, being cut off from the rest, fled towards a steep precipice at a little distance from the convent: there the innocent babes were thrown over the rocks by their despairing mothers, whilst the women themselves, preferring death to the dishonour that awaited them, joined hand in hand, and raising their minds to the highest pitch of enthusiasm by songs in honour of their lost country, they whirled round and round in a species of frantic dance, like ancient Thyades, till they approached the very edge of the cliff; then with a loud shout of defiance, and as it were by a preconcerted signal, one and all threw themselves headlong down.

“ Those of the Suliot exiles who escaped from Zalongo pursued their way through storms of wind and rain aided by the darkness of night, fathers leading their children in one hand and carrying their naked swords in the other, mothers tying their infants on their backs, and some even putting them to death lest their cries should attract the attention of their pursuers. Next day however they were discovered by the Albanians, surrounded and made prisoners; but subsequently were released and allowed by the vizir to settle at Vurgareli, which is at the foot of Mount Tzumerka, six hours distant from Arta. After their surrender a party of the Albanians withdrew to a place called Rhiniasa, near the ruins of an ancient city, supposed to have been Elatria: here was a small settlement of Suliots, most of whom had fled, except the family of one Giorgaki Botzi, whose wife and children inhabited a large pyrgo, or tower, called the Gula τῆς Δημυλῶς, which was barricadoed against attack. The barbarous soldiers surrounded their habitation and called upon these unhappy females to yield: the mistress, named Despo, then assembled her family together and asked them if they preferred death to dishonour? Being unanimously answered in the affirmative, she ordered them to fire off all the ammunition which had been left in the tower against the ruffians, except one barrel of gunpowder: to this she herself applied a match and blew up the tower with all its tenants into the air.

“ But the scene is not yet to close over the miserable remnant of Suli. Ali, whose revenge was still unsatiated, sent a considerable body of forces against the colony of Vurgareli with orders for its extirpation. The unfortunate colonists having received intimation of his design decamped suddenly, and took up a strong position at the monastery of Seltzo, at the foot of a mountain called Fruzia, not far from the Achelous. In the latter end of January, 1804, they were attacked here by an army of Albanians, which for the horrid purpose of revenge had been picked out of the relatives and friends of those who had fallen in the wars of Suli. After a siege of several months,

in which these miserable exiles bravely resisted the attempts of their enemies, Ali sent strong reinforcements with a severe reprimand to his officers, and orders for a general assault. Thus stimulated, the barbarians made another attempt which was attended with success: the Suliots were all put to the sword, except a few that escaped into Acarnania, whilst the women in a fit of desperation ran towards the Acheulous and cast both their children and themselves into its stream.

"The Suliot mountains being evacuated by their brave defenders, Ali repaired the towers and forts, and laid the foundation of that splendid fortified serai which now adorns the highest top of Kiaffa, and is the strongest post in all his dominions. In the mean time the poor Suliots, dispersed abroad amongst the neighbouring tribes, took refuge, some at Santa Maura and others with the Albanian beys; but the greatest part retired to Parga and Corfu: here they subsisted upon charity, or enrolled themselves in the service of their protectors, whilst the sight of their dark mountains towering above the Tzamouriot hills, and the thoughts of those days when they wandered about their native rocks free as the mountain storm, filled their hearts with melancholy recollections. A source from which they endeavoured to draw consolation in their misfortunes was the composition of patriotic songs, which they sung upon the downfall of their country and the valour of her sons." (Hughes's Travels, vol. ii. p. 167—170.)

Parga is debatable ground: but the whole question seems to lie in a narrow compass. Parga had for a long time been the favourite object of Ali's ambition. Its position on the main land of Greece, its advantages as a place of strength, and especially as an outwork of the island of Corfu, and the preponderancy which it could not fail to confer upon him as the arbiter of that part of Greece, whilst it was not only contiguous to, but in fact actually surrounded by, his own dominions, naturally made him anxious for its occupation. Those very reasons, on the other hand, rendered it a matter of the strictest prudence that those powers who occupied the Seven Islands, and Corfu in particular, should retain firm hold of that important fortress and its territory. Ali Pasha had other motives for crushing this independent republic. It frequently afforded an asylum to the victims of his tyranny, and particularly to the unhappy Suliotes. The odium *in longum jacens* is the habitual passion of his breast. His resentment against Gardiki increased with his progress from youth to manhood. After the unsuccessful attack made by Ali on Parga, in February 1814, the Parghiotes still trembled while so powerful an enemy hovered over their borders, and the French garrison were wholly inert in their defence. They had lost also two of their frontier villages, whose inhabitants were partly put to death, and partly sent into a slavery worse than death. Under these circumstances, they requested to be received under the British protection; and it does appear to have

been determined that if they would disarm the French garrison, they should be taken under that protection as a dependency of the Ionian Islands. Such is the compact said to have taken place between General Campbell and the Parghiotes. But whatever was the stipulation, this was the sense in which it was interpreted by the Parghiotes: and the French garrison having been sent to Corfu, the British took possession of the place in March, 1814.

"Under the powerful ægis" for we must borrow Mr. Hughes's account of the transaction, "of Great Britain, Parga remained for about three years comparatively happy, increasing both in wealth and population, although the mention of its name was omitted in the treaties of Vienna and Paris, which consigned to English protection the Septinsular republic. Strange rumours however were soon set afloat, highly calculated to disturb the tranquillity of its citizens; but they were still unable to believe that a Christian power, so noted for its integrity, would give them up to their bloody and inveterate enemy; under this conviction their devoted attachment to their protectors was shown in every mode that a grateful, industrious, and moral people, like the Parghiotes, could possibly devise: but whoever has perused the foregoing history of Ali Pasha, will be prepared to believe that his ambitious mind would not rest quietly when disappointed in a design which lay nearest his heart. His gold proved in this, as in many other instances, all-powerful at Constantinople. Parga was demanded by the Porte as the price of her acquiescence in our occupation of the Ionian isles; and a secret treaty consigned over to Mahometan despotism the last little spot of ancient Greece which had remained unpolluted by her infidel conquerors.

"An article however was inserted in this treaty, which provided that every person who emigrated should be remunerated for the loss of his property; and if the terms of this agreement had been fairly and strictly adhered to, the Parghiotes would not have had so much apparent reason to accuse their protectors of adding injustice to a cruel policy. The resolution of the high contracting powers was not communicated to this people, before the month of March, 1817. It was then announced to them by the Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian islands through the medium of Lieut. Col. de Bosset, with whom a reinforcement of 300 British troops were sent to repress all commotions, and secure the garrison from danger. It is but justice to that excellent officer to say that in this delicate situation, obliged by military duty to fulfil his orders, and urged by a natural generosity to give ear to the pathetic remonstrances and despairing resolves of the miserable suppliants, he shaped his course in such a manner as to entitle him to the praise of the good and virtuous, the approbation of his own conscience, and the eternal gratitude of the unfortunate Parghiotes.

"Considerable pains were taken in persuading this people to transfer allegiance to that intriguing foe who wished to become their sovereign; but in vain: a thorough knowledge of his character acquired

by an experience of thirty years, saved them from this extremity of calamity. With one voice they resolved, if the decree against their beloved country was irrevocable, to beg their bread in foreign lands rather than be butchered in cold blood by a tyrant who had sworn to sacrifice every Parghiot to his implacable revenge. Who that has perused these pages will be surprised at their resolution? Under such circumstances Colonel de Bosset ordered an estimate to be taken of public and of private property. This amounted, on a very moderate calculation, to more than 500,000 pounds, a very small pittance for a well-built city, containing near 4000 inhabitants, and villages peopled with many more, in a tract of the most fertile territory that can be imagined, within a circuit of twenty miles, enriched with 81,000 olive trees, from which the finest oil in the Levant was made and exported on the most advantageous terms.

"With this sum however the poor inhabitants professed themselves satisfied, and consented to be transported from the land of their birth, the sepulchres of their forefathers, the edifices of their religious worship, and all those sweet associations which render the name of our country so sacred. Ali Pasha however was not quite so contented, as he thought it very hard to pay any thing at all for a place which he always affects to consider his own by right of promise. Agents therefore were sent to him at Ioannina, who entered into a long and tedious negotiation, which was studiously protracted by Ali, for the purpose of gaining time and watching any opportunity that might occur for seizing his unguarded prey. In the mean time the poor victims had been deprived of their best friend: Colonel de Bosset being considered an unfit agent in these transactions, was relieved from his post and departed for England: other commissioners were appointed to value the property of the Parghiotes; Ali poured his troops around their frontiers, and exerted every nerve to gain possession of the place by endeavouring to sow dissensions, to poison the water and bread of the inhabitants, to introduce a number of his adherents into the city by stratagem, and to terrify the people by the most horrid threats and menaces of vengeance unless they submitted to his authority. In this state of distress, augmented to the utmost by Ali's agents, who prohibited all supplies wherever his authority extended, the ministers of religion, joined by the primates, set a noble example of patriotism and liberality for the relief of their suffering brethren; and by their means a supply of corn, though scanty, was procured.

"At length appeared the new valuation of property, for which a sum less than 150,000*l.* sterling was deemed an equivalent! and after some further delay, during which all remonstrances were answered only by threats, preparations were at length made for the evacuation of Parga, which took place on the 10th of April, 1819, during the festival of Easter.

"By the Lord High Commissioner's orders, the officer commanding the British garrison at Parga made known to the inhabitants, that according to arrangements made with Ali Pasha, a Turkish force was to enter their territory without delay; but that the English troops would remain for their protection until the emigration was completed.

On receiving this intimation, which was confirmed by the appearance of a large Ottoman force, the Parghiotes, having held a consultation, sent to inform the commandant, that such being the determination of the British government, they had unanimously resolved, that should one single Turk enter their territory before all of them had a fair opportunity of quitting it, they would put to death their wives and children, and defend themselves to the last extremity against any force, Turkish or Christian, that should violate the solemn pledge which had been given them.

“The English commandant, perceiving by the preparations that their resolution was fixed, instantly dispatched information to the Lord High Commissioner at Corfu, who sent to expostulate with the Parghiotes. When the British officers arrived at Parga, the inhabitants were disinterring the bones of their ancestors from the churches and cemeteries, and burning or burying them in secret places to prevent their profanation by the Turks. The primates, with the protopapas at their head, assured the officers that the meditated sacrifice would be immediately executed, unless they could stop the entrance of the Turks who had already arrived near the frontier, and effectually protect their embarkation. This appeared to be no idle threat, and fortunately means were found which prevailed with the Ottoman commandant to halt his forces: in the mean time the Glasgow frigate, which had been sent from Corfu, having arrived, the embarkation commenced. It is said that the appearance of this brave people, kneeling down to kiss for the last time the land which gave them birth, and watering it with their tears, was a most affecting scene: some of them carried away a handful of the soil, to be a solace in their misfortunes, an inheritance to their children, a memento of their wrongs, and a stimulus to the recovery of their country: others took for the same purpose a small portion of those sacred ashes from their pile, which had been once animated by the spirits of their forefathers, and many carried away the bones which they had not time to burn. When the bands of Ali Pasha reached the walls, all was solitude and silence. The city, as it has been observed, received its infidel garrison as Babylon or Palmyra salutes the Christian traveller in the desert—nothing breathed, nothing moved; the houses were desolate, the nation was extinct, the bones of the dead were almost consumed to ashes, whilst the only sign that living creatures had been there was the smoke slowly ascending from the funeral piles.” (Hughes’s *Travels*, vol. ii. p. 203—208.)

Ali became, by this possession, master of continental Greece, from the Attic boundary of Parnes to the mountains of Illyrium. We wish that we could cite the character which Mr. Hughes has drawn of this extraordinary chieftain. We can only select a few features from the portrait, in addition to the other traits which have been incidentally mentioned in the course of our article. The basis of his character is selfishness. He regards all human beings as instruments of his own purposes; no pity or remorse ever touches him, and his very successes are as much

owing to his iron insensibility, as to his talent or courage. His science is that of human nature, and he has well studied every turn and winding of the human heart. He is quick and decisive, but never abandons his object. The multitude are dazzled by his dexterity; and the attachment of his troops is secured, not more by his own participation in their hardships and their perils, than by the arts which win their confidence, or flatter their humours. No man was ever a greater master of intrigue. It is this, in conjunction with bribes seasonably applied, which has made the Porte so long a willing accessory to his projects. His perfidy is more than Punic. He allures his enemies by promises and outward kindness, and then remorselessly destroys them. Wealth is his idol, and his avarice is insatiable. Not content with his ordinary sources of revenue, he has recourse to the meanest arts of extortion. The great repository of his immense wealth, to the amount, according to the conjecture of Mr. Hughes, of two millions sterling, is a lofty tower, in the garden of his Tepeleni seraglio; but he has an immense collection of jewels, with huge piles of furniture, and all kinds of utensils, pillaged from individuals, and cities and towns taken by assault, or received under his protection.

Still, however, there is a more favourable side of the picture. We perfectly agree with Mr. Hughes that we ought to estimate him with a reference to the habits of his country, and the principles of his religion; and our own experience enables us to add, that a total disregard to the life of man, of which they who have not visited the country can have no conception, is to be observed in almost every act of government in Turkey. There is no doubt that, through the whole extent of Ali's dominions life and property are better protected than in any other part of European Turkey. The almost total annihilation of robbery through that vast extent of country, intersected with mountainous defiles, from which, not long since, hordes of plunderers rushed upon the unwary traveller or defenceless merchant, could only have been effected by dreadful and tremendous punishments. It is to this system of terror, indeed, that the prosperity of Albania, and the contiguous territory, is to be mainly ascribed. Besides this, another circumstance distinguishes these provinces from the rest of the Ottoman empire: no petty tyrants, the great curse of Mahometan countries, exist there. One absorbing despotism swallows up all those inferior authorities, which constitute, in other parts of Turkey, a gradual chain of vexations, exactions, and tormenting oppressions, from the lowest delegate to the supreme authority. Add to this, religious toleration, the effect probably of religious indifference, the establishment of a police, the im-

provement of roads, the building of bridges, and many other politic arrangements and wholesome regulations.

Mr. Hughes's residence at Ioannina afforded him copious opportunities of observing the usages of the modern Greeks. They are abstemious, early risers, and generally transact their business before an Englishman takes his breakfast. After a pipe, and cup of coffee, the Greek saunters about till noon, when his dinner is served up to him, which consists in general of boiled rice, vegetables dressed in oil, mutton baked with almonds or pistachio-nuts, pilau, columbades made of olives, thin pastry of eggs, flour, and honey. The dishes are placed separately on the table, and each person helps himself with fork or spoon, or fingers, out of the same vessel. After dinner the females retire to the *gynekaïos*, and the men to their siesta. Visits are generally made in the afternoon, at which pipes and coffee are served to the guests.

Much has been said, we have always thought too much, of the advanced state of literature in Ioannina, and some writers have dignified it with the appellation of the modern Athens. Mr. Hughes, with whose opinion we fully accord, thinks this a violent figure of speech. The mind of the Greek is but just awakened from the sleep of centuries; an oblivious sleep from which the spirits have derived no strength, no refreshment. The untrodden soul (the *ψυχή αβύσσος*) is no more. Their literature consists at present only in feeble copies of the ancients. Elaborate truisms, superficial remarks, false and affected turns of antithesis, and epigram at variance with taste and simplicity, seem to be the prevalent style of their compositions. Their talents have hitherto, however, been chiefly exercised in translation, an employment calculated, we apprehend, still further to debase and corrupt their idiom. We can only hope that this is but a stage and resting-place in their progress; notwithstanding the prevailing ignorance and decrepitude of the nation, we may look forward to the period when a race of men, once the most powerful and enlightened upon the earth, may be aroused to a sense of their intellectual bondage; and, inspired by the recollection of their illustrious origin, may assert their proper rank amongst the polished and enlightened countries of Europe.

Having thus given a sketch of the contents of these voluminous but entertaining works, we dismiss them both with sincere commendation. Mr. Dodwell's volumes will always be an indispensable part of every extensive library, and a most essential aid to those who are studious of Grecian antiquities;—and if Mr. Hughes will, in a future revision of his interesting tour, avoid hyperbolical and turgid diction to which we have already adverted, and adopt a simpler and more subdued style, it will find

its place in all standard collections of voyages and travels; a place which it well merits from the spirit and accuracy of its details, and the learning and industry displayed in its illustrations.

ART. IX.—*A Vision of Judgement.* By Robert Southey, Esq. LL.D. Poet Laureate, &c. 4to. pp. 79. Longman & Co. London, 1821.

MR. SOUTHEY is now almost beyond our jurisdiction. The corrections of criticism can have but two legitimate motives—to amend the practice of the party criticised, and to obviate the influence of his example upon others. On the subject of this last poem we think Mr. Southey is decidedly insane, and the cure of literary madness exceeds our art or undertaking. The particular case, too, of this unfortunate gentleman is the more hopeless, as we find him, even in the deliberate mood in which we may suppose his preface to have been written, characterizing the whole body of disapprovers of his new experiment, wherever they are found, by the universal attribute of ‘the duncery;’ see Preface xiv. To aim at correcting the author, therefore, in such a case, would be an attempt warranted by no reasonable prospect of utility; and to oppose the influence of an example so stamped with absurdity, has been rendered quite unnecessary. But the principle upon which the innovation is defended by this original versifier, implies such a lofty contempt of all authority, all habit, all that has been prescriptively determined by the ear, all that the genius of the language has for centuries established, and all that has been taught by repeated failures, that it is altogether too much for the temper of Reviewers to be tranquil under so much provocation. But Mr. Southey treats all this as prejudice; and, while he admits blank verse to be a form of metre better suited to the structure of our language, he contends that the fastidiousness of the British ear should be overcome in favour of a metrical collocation of words, which, if not agreeable, ought to be so because it is so in the prosody of the languages of Greece and Rome.

To us it appears that when we say that our language moves awkwardly in hexameters,—when we admit that whether it be from the want of a sufficient variety of termination and inflexion, or from a certain stiffness or stubbornness produced by the crowding of its consonants, or from a tardiness in its flow, occasioned by the frequency of its monosyllables, or from whatever other resistance in its texture and materials, the ears of

Englishmen are opposed to hexameters in their native tongue, and are immediately sensible of something incongruous and incompatible in the union,—we say quite enough to condemn the revival of an experiment so often tried in vain. If certain forms of rhythm and versification have taken possession of the ear by long usage; if by mutual coadaptation, and the mellowing effects of time and habit, a language has grown into an harmonious correspondence with certain metrical arrangements (and in what instance is this not so?)—where is the equivalent for all this sacrifice of the habitual predilection of the ear, if it be only to force into use a new and anomalous metre, which can never become agreeable till the very principles of taste and national prosody are reversed.

After all, however, Mr. Southey confesses himself to find the language perfectly unmanageable, and that it absolutely refuses to afford him more than the dactyl and trochee at the end of his line, towards the constitution of his hexameters. The endings of the verses perform the office of designating the metre, while the rest is given up to trochees, dactyls, or anapaests, as chance or occasion may determine; and thus Mr. Southey appears to intend an improvement of general harmony, by crossing the breed between the Latin and English metres. The whole attempt, however, has most ridiculously failed. The five syllables at the end of the line, on which our poet so securely relies for their characteristic force in deciding the verse, are often contumacious, and are so far from sustaining the weight of the whole line, as to be altogether without buoyancy in themselves, and generally indeed to sink with a sort of alacrity into vulgar prose. To be sure, Mr. Southey does not exact much of the language in the article of rhythm. He puts a certain number of syllables together, which may be comprised in a certain number of feet; and then announces his verse as hexameter, leaving the ear to extract the harmony as it can, as the sign-post painter having produced the human face divine, and written under it ‘The Duke of Wellington,’ leaves the gazer to make out the resemblance for himself, that being his and not the painter’s affair.

Mr. Southey himself points out some of the characteristics of our language, which render it incapable of the Latin and Greek hexameter, and among others, that the “feet must too frequently be made up of monosyllables, and of distinct words, whereby the verse is resolved and decomposed into its component feet, and the feet into their component syllables, instead of being articulated and inosculated throughout, as in the German, still more in the Greek, and most in the Latin. This, he observes, is certainly a great defect.” Now all these we should have imagined were powerful reasons to dissuade from the undertaking, for com-

mon sense tells us (and common sense is precisely the monitor to which it would do Mr. Southey the greatest good to listen), that if a language is ill adapted to a particular mode of versification, that particular mode should be let alone. The inconvenience, as to room indeed, which is mentioned in the note to page xv. in the preface, as a consequence of adopting this measure, is a charge that might have been spared by a writer, whose page is of such capacious size, that his lengthy lines may float therein as much at their ease as Leviathan in the great deep.

Mr. Southey, indeed, belongs to a class of writers which may be called the school of independence. It seems as if there was something in his mind which must be at enmity with order in some of its departments; a root of indiscipline, too deep and luxuriant to be destroyed or extirpated; and which, if stopped in one place, will infallibly break out in another. If it be *duncery*, according to the expression above alluded to, to be insensible to the beauty of his English hexameters, we desire to stand among the foremost of this denounced fraternity, for, in good truth, we like his new poetry no better than his old politics: they are, indeed, somewhat allied: nor can we account for his folly in thus wasting the stock of his reputation, but by considering that vanity has an indestructible privilege of exposing itself:—when it can no longer quarrel with authority, it claims a right to revolt against experience.

What the Quarterly Reviewers will do with these hexameters, or how they will get over the difficult and delicate dilemma into which they are brought by this mistake of Mr. Southey, we are at a loss to conjecture. Will they say it was designed to be the last practical exposure of the futility of this often repeated experiment upon our much tormented language? or will they despotically pronounce the work to be a real poem in the disguise of prose, after the manner of Lord Peter? or will they say, with Spurzheim, that there must be a certain organization of the cranium to comprehend the beauties of this measure? or that it appeals to a certain relish of the artificial kind, to be acquired like the taste for tobacco? or that every reader, thinking or feeling differently from this poet, ought to suppose the fault in himself? or that, at any rate, it is the fault of the language, and not of the writer, who has done all that could be done with his materials? or that, to give to this metre its due effect, a certain art in reading it is requisite, which may be learned with somewhat less than two years study, and best perhaps in the Royal Dutch Institute of which Mr. Southey is a member? or that it is enough that Mr. Southey assures us that he can read the lines musically, of which any one may be satisfied personally by a visit to Cumberland, where he may see the lakes into the bargain? or, if none of

these arguments will be thought sufficient, will they remind us that the visions of a trance must be taken as we find them, being a ghostly tribe that defy the manacles of metre? or will they at once magnificently maintain that these poets of the Lakes, live in a franchised district, out of the jurisdiction of common sense and common sound; where the ear has no right of cognizance, and where special customs exclude the sober and ordinary institutions by which the Muses uphold their dominion?

We observed in our last number, that the British Review was free from some of the embarrassments which the state and mutations of parties in the critical, as well as the political, world, must sometimes occasion to other quarterly journals. Mr. Southey's Sapphics have undergone the chastisement of the anti-jacobin critics, but Mr. Southey's hexameters are safe from the anti-jacobin writers of the Quarterly Review. He may sit under the shade of his laurel, and dream or drivel with impunity in his inverted prose and poetry. Another author of minor poems has, as well as Mr. Southey, experienced the severity of the critics. He retorted, and his grey goose quill was felt like the shaft of Percy upon the Scottish border. It was soon perceived that these enemies might undo one another; their politics and morals were the same, and literary envy gave way to the interests of a common cause. These Scotch critics were never more to lash, and this English Pogasus was never more to kick. Pestilential as are the poems of the writer last alluded to, and high as are the pretensions of the Quarterly Reviewers to religion and morality, these writers touch him not; his polluted banner is in the middle of their camp; the infidel passes unrebuked before the champions of the mitre and the sceptre; which things could never be but for some peculiar feeling that perverts the principles of moral and manly criticism.

Mr. Southey's preface is not to be placed among the number of his happiest compositions. He seems to write with a mind not altogether unconscious of the absurdity of his undertaking, and yet forced into it by a sort of destiny which he finds it impossible to resist. The vanity of succeeding where all before him had failed seems to have been his betrayer. So fearfully does he anticipate the censure of the critics, that a method is adopted of frightening them from their purpose, we may say from their duty, which we do not remember to have seen in practice before. He is extremely angry with those who accuse him of preferring the strange inconsonant arbitrary measures, which he has thought fit to adopt, to "the regular blank verse, the noblest measure in his judgment, of which our admirable language is capable." He has preferred it, as he tells us, only where it suited the character of the poem; as in the rhythmical romance of

Thalaba for example, in which it appeared to him to be the "Arabesque" ornament of "an Arabian tale." And with those unhappy men who did not or would not understand or accede to this distinction, "he will enter into no explanations." They are, to say no worse of them, the *duncery* of the day; and, after some intimations of their being persons of "malevolent" dispositions, and deficient "in the proper sense of honour;" the author proceeds to put the point to his readers rather as a question of fact than opinion, and considers his "veracity" concerned in the correctness of what he states to be the disadvantages of his present extraordinary metre, rather than his taste and discernment.

The only way of meeting this new mode of discussing subjects of general criticism and philology, is first to do all manner of justice to the integrity of the writer, by declaring ourselves fully to credit what he says upon his word and honour, of his own preferences, and his reasons for acting in opposition to them; and then to tell him candidly, that we see no sense in his reasons for departing from his own preferences; challenging the same right to be believed upon our words and honours. But whatever defence; in the particular case of Thalaba, the style of what Mr. Southey calls "Arabesque ornament," might have afforded to that singular performance, of which we confess ourselves incompetent judges, being incapable of seeing any thing in this Arabesque style, if such it be, but uncouth extravagance, there surely is no such characteristic fitness with which the exotic verse which Mr. Southey, upon the present occasion, has chosen, adjusts itself to the subject on which it is employed. Hexameters, which have hitherto been the vehicle of idolatrous fables, and have been so long associated with the impure imaginations and superstitious inventions of heathen antiquity, can have no fitness; one would think, from affinity, or use, or habit, for the colloquies of saints and angels, or the transactions of the great day, when Jehovah shall reckon with his creatures, and appoint them their everlasting doom. The author will not, surely, say, I do not prefer, as you know, or ought to know, ye "malevolent" dunces, and men "without a proper sense of honour," this metre, so ill suited to our "admirable language," to "regular blank verse;" but it has such a special adaptation to the high and holy theme on which I have chosen to descant, and offers itself as so fit a vehicle for expressing the decrees which are finally to sum up all righteousness, mercy, equity, and truth, that I have given it the precedence to all other metres on this transcendent occasion.

"I first adventure, follow me who list," is the challenge which this writer proclaims, and proclaims to insensible ears. No one who has a prudent regard to his literary reputation will follow him. Mr. Southey's fame may survive the adventure, but there

are few poets who would not pass along this road through temporary ridicule to final oblivion. There are various modes of mortality by which poets die out of the memory of mankind, but we are persuaded that, if Mr. Southey's example were to excite general imitation, the disease of hexameters would soon, perhaps not unusefully, reduce to one half the population of Parnassus. We say, *not unusefully*, because we cannot help cordially assenting to Mr. Southey's remarks in the 3d section of his preface, where he very properly, though in terms less forcible and discriminative than might be used, rebukes the contaminating tendency of the greater part of modern poetry. It is, indeed, what we find it here denominated, the "furniture of the brothel." But if the poets of this order could be persuaded to become the imitators of this new style of versification, their pollutions and blasphemies might lie and rot in cold hexameters, forgotten till the day of retribution shall realize something more awful and terrific than Mr. Southey's "Vision of Judgement." In the mean time, however, it will do these noblemen and gentlemen, who have been accumulating against themselves the vengeance of that dreadful day of visitation, no harm to read the just and feeling animadversions of Mr. Southey on their wretched productions:—

"The publication of a lascivious book is one of the worst offences which can be committed against the well-being of society. It is a sin, to the consequences of which no limits can be assigned, and those consequences no after repentance in the writer can counteract.—Whatever remorse of conscience he may feel when his hour comes (and come it must) will be of no avail. The poignancy of a death-bed repentance cannot cancel one copy of the thousands which are sent abroad; and as long as it continues to be read, so long is he the pandar of posterity, and so long is he heaping up guilt upon his soul in perpetual accumulation.

"These remarks are not more severe than the offence deserves, even when applied to those immoral writers who have not been conscious of any evil intention in their writings, who would acknowledge a little levity, a little warmth of colouring, and so forth, in that sort of language with which men gloss over their favourite vices, and deceive themselves. What then should be said of those for whom the thoughtlessness and the inebriety of wanton youth can no longer be pleaded, but who have written in sober manhood and with deliberate purpose?—Men of diseased hearts and depraved imaginations, who, forming a system of opinions to suit their own unhappy course of conduct, have rebelled against the holiest ordinances of human society, and hating that revealed religion which, with all their efforts and bravadoes, they are unable entirely to disbelieve, labour to make others as miserable as themselves, by infecting them with a moral virus that eats into the soul! The school which they have set up may properly be called the Satanic school; for though their productions breathe the spirit of

Belial in their lascivious parts, and the spirit of Moloch in those loathsome images of atrocities and horrors which they delight to represent, they are more especially characterized by a Satanic spirit of pride and audacious impiety, which still betrays the wretched feelings of hopelessness wherewith it is allied." (Preface, p. xviii.—xxi.)

What seems least explainable in this infatuated attempt of Mr. Southey, is his persisting in it with an apparent conviction of the impossibility of altering the quantities and the general habitual pronunciation of our language without the destruction of its natural emphasis and the worst effects upon the ear. This he remarks upon as the perpetual cause of the failure of all those who, in the Elizabethan age of our literature, made the experiment. He gives several examples of this failure in Sidney and his followers, who, in defiance of a fixed habit of pronunciation, and the established principles and genius of the language, were bent upon subjecting it to the rules of the Latin prosody. One would have supposed that so experienced a writer, seeing in such a case the alternative to be a departure from the true structure of the hexameter, or a sacrifice of the vernacular pronunciation, would have yielded to so decisive an objection; but with a singular pertinacity of purpose, Mr. Southey has thought good to construct a metre, which, after doing violence to the prosody of one language and the orthoepy of another, results in a barbarous diction, which poetry disclaims and prose rejects; whose only merit will be the negative good it will render to Mr. Southey's well-earned fame, and the republic of letters, by rapidly hurrying back into the limbo of abortive and forgotten things this morbid vision—the untoward offspring of a teeming brain and unsubjugated fancy.

Mr. Southey, after adverting to some proofs of the practicability of the hexameter in our language, given about 20 years ago in some translations of the Messiah of Klopstock, which appeared in the *Monthly Magazine*, and an eclogue called the *Showman*, printed in the 2d volume of the *Annual Anthology*, neither of which specimens we have had the felicity of perusing, written, as he tells us, by his old friend Mr. William Taylor, of Norwich, of whom he takes this occasion of making very honourable mention,—informs us, that in repeating the experiment upon a more adequate scale, and upon a subject suited to the movement, he had fulfilled one of the hopes and intentions of his early life. So that Mr. Southey appears to have been under this infatuation during the greater part of his existence. He seems to have been engaged to the undertaking by some sickly vow made in a moment of constitutional imbecility or morbid delirium, and to have had his fancy so impressed by the fond persuasion as to be utterly incurable, by argument or experiment. But the

most curious circumstance of his malady, for it really appears to have been of the class of mental disorders, is the connection it has suggested to his imagination between the *movement* of English hexameters and the topic of his poem. It would have been well, indeed, if upon the ground of this supposed affinity, he could have been persuaded to put off the undertaking to the *day of judgement*, in the proverbial phrase: But, unhappily, the superior attraction has been on the side of the poetical project, and thus has been forced into being, a composition comprising absurdity, incongruity, bad taste, debasing imagery, mock majesty, and ludicrous description, on a greater scale of exhibition and exposure than we recollect to have seen instanced in any production of the British muse; and all this from the pen of a man of unquestionable genius, and fine poetical taste.

It is unnecessary to apprise our Readers that Mr. Southey has long been a very loyal subject, steadily, and we believe upon the best motives, attached to the Crown. The hero of his poem is his late Majesty George the Third, (in the honour paid to whose memory we have shewn, in former parts of our journal, how feelingly we ourselves acquiesce;) whom he ventures to follow, upon the strength, we presume, of the congeniality, before remarked, between his great theme and the *movement* of his new metre, into the place where the spirits of the just and the unjust are to receive their final sentence and allotment. The table of contents, which is short, will let the reader, with some saving of trouble to ourselves, into the scheme of the poem. The heads are the 12 following:—The Trance—The Vault—The Awakening—The Gate of Heaven—The Accusers—The Absolvers—The Beatification—The Sovereigns—The Elder Worthies—The Worthies of the Georgian Age—The Young Spirits—The Meeting. To which succeed certain notes and specimens.

For the infusion of religion into the higher poetry, we entertain a strong predilection. This rank of poetry seems to us to derive a distinct and special advantage from the admixture,—to receive from the union a certain chastening and lustration, together with a vast accession of interest and dignity. Religion, too, in some of its parts, may well be adopted by the poet as his entire subject; but in this use of religion there is danger of abuse: there is a holy limit to which the muse must restrain herself. "So transcendantly awful are some portions of this "great argument," that nothing less than *real* inspiration can reach them;—the celestial task could only be accomplished by those who have been permitted to draw aside the curtain of the sanctuary. That inconceivably tremendous day, when we shall all stand before the seat of Christ, no longer our Mediator, but our Judge, is surely among the subjects, if any, that are interdicted to the poet. Young

has, indeed, just ventured on the confines of this overpowering theme; but he has left it under the pavilion of its own magnificent and awful generalities, not feeling himself licensed to trespass even in thought upon that holy ground, or venture in imagination beyond its flaming and appalling barrier: and yet his genius for such descriptions was chartered to the utmost extent of human capacity. Moreover, such a consummation is no subject of general sympathy, or of partnership in sensibility, but a deep, solitary, and personal concern. It affords no medium like that through which epic or tragic composition works its way to the soul; but is regarded with an individual interest that absorbs all that we call sentiment, and beggars all the pomp of figurative description. In a word, the naked reality is too sublime in itself, and of a character too severe to admit of the dress or drapery which fiction would throw around it; and the danger is too actual, instant, and substantial to be properly or decently adopted as the subject of fanciful representation. We are sorry Mr. Southey has felt this matter in a different way. We have no doubt of the sincerity of his religious principles; but we cannot help suspecting that he has not yet entered far enough into the subject to judge with correctness of the extent to which it may be incorporated with the works of imagination. Incomparably the worst of his productions are those in which he has treated of religious men, and religious opinions; and we cannot help seeing that he has wrongly estimated his own theological attainments. It is not by an occasional diving into the depths of this vital subject for a few pearls to embellish our stanzas—it is not by turning over the pages of Jeremy Taylor, or Isaac Barrow, for brilliant expressions and bold imagery—it is not by the use or discrimination of orthodox phrases or dogmas of divinity, or by the censure or exposure of the errors of dissent and enthusiasm, but by a constant, humble, and unwearied consultation of the Bible itself, with thorough pains-taking and earnest prayer to understand it aright,—that we become eminent or advanced Christians. We are far from undervaluing Mr. Southey, or his attainments. Very few writers have done more to raise and establish the literary fame of their country; but we cannot help thinking that he has gone beyond his knowledge in treating on certain subjects, and has dissipated his talents in the service of his ambition and of his employers over a wider field than has been consistent with their successful and beneficial exertion.

In the poem before us Mr. Southey has, we suppose, given us a representation of the tremendous scene of that great day of decision, which is to fix the eternal destiny of accountable beings; such as in a general view, it has painted itself upon his own ima-

gination, or such as may stand at least with his own religious conceptions. If this be so, we do not exactly see from what authority or source he has derived those conceptions. One great person whom we should have expected to have found in this awful scene acting a very conspicuous part, is altogether missing in Mr. Southey's exhibition; and two descriptions of official characters, called the *Accusers* and the *Absolvers*, we know not where to find, save in the creative imagination of this adventurous poet. Adventurous, however, as our poet may be considered, he does not rush without some formality upon this stage of wonders. The incantations and ablutions which have preceded the entrance of other heroes into the world of spirits, Mr. Southey supplies by a trance, from which he is awakened by the voice of some mysterious being who acts as his introducer into the august ceremonies, but who so far merges the propriety of situation in admiration of the poet, as to address him by the title of "Son of the Muses!" This son of the muses then finds himself in an arched vault, well furnished with coffins, palls, urns, and hatchments. This vault, it may well be supposed, was not without its curiosities:—its otherwise gloomy interior was illumined by a soft cerulean light, such as the sapphire sheds, and strains so heavenly breathed upon his ear, as induced him at once to credit all that the poets relate of Amphion and Orpheus. The whole scene soon changes; the apparatus and symbols of mortality vanish, and the dead awake from their long sleep. Immediately he sees the reverend form of our late good King rise from a cloud which covered the pavement, and bend heavenward his course. Some few words are uttered by the monarch as he mounts, expressive of his well-known trust in Him who is mighty to save; but his soliloquy is interrupted by the approach of his late minister, Mr. Percival, of whom he asks many questions respecting the conduct of his son and successor, and of the affairs of his kingdom, since his ceasing to hold the sceptre. Mr. Percival then relates to him the honourable termination of the war, with all the circumstances which attended it, and particularly the manner in which Buonaparte had been disposed of: which events, by the by, we cannot understand why Mr. Percival should have any more certain knowledge of than the King himself, seeing that that gentleman's acquaintance with these facts could have proceeded only from his being in the condition in which George the Third is supposed to be at the moment of this conference. The joy of the monarch on receiving these welcome tidings is somewhat damped by his being told of the efforts of the factious to bring fresh troubles upon his kingdom—an inference to which the faithful minister is led by his observing the ghosts of Robe-

spierre, Danton, Hebert, Faux, and Despard upon the alert. George the Third now approaches the adamantine gates of heaven, and there an angel stands, who from the summit makes the following announcement :

“ Ho ! he exclaim’d, King George of England cometh to judgement ! Hear Heaven ! Ye Angels hear ! Souls of the Good and the Wicked Whom it concerns, attend ! Thou, Hell, bring forth his accusers ! As the sonorous summons was utter’d, the Winds, who were waiting, Bore it abroad thro’ Heaven ; and Hell, in her nethermost caverns, Heard, and obey’d in dismay.” (p. 13.)

We have then a description of the multitudinous throng of the good on the one side, and the wicked on the other, surrounding the tribunal ; in which description there is a display of considerable power of language shining amidst the poet’s absurdest hallucinations.

The soul of the King now stands before the “ Presence ” to receive his sentence ;—proclamation is made for his accusers. The Demon of discord or democracy, or some such personage, makes his appearance, with two guilty souls in his train, whom he produces as the King’s prosecutors. The persons executing this office turn out to be Wilkes and Junius ; the one distinguished by a cast of his eyes, and the other with his face concealed, and his secret perpetuated under an iron visor. The Accusers are, however, brought to the bar in vain ; they stand confounded by the presence of the injured monarch, without the power of utterance, till the angry Demon, disappointed of his purpose, hurls them both back into sulphurous darkness, and is soon after constrained, by a whirlwind, to follow them, which reminds us of the melancholy fate of two distinguished persons whose memory nursery tradition has handed down to us, a subject well suited to the “ movement ” of the hexameter verse :

“ Jack ascended the hill, and Jill he ascended it also,
Down tumbled poor Jack, and Jill he came tumbling down after,
Jack fractured his crown, but of Jill nothing more is recorded.”

We beg not to be understood as imputing plagiarism to Mr. Southey ; the similarity may have been purely accidental. There is certainly something more epic in the catastrophe of Jack and Jill, than in that of Junius and Jack Wilkes steeped in brimstone.

So much for the Accusers, and now for the Absolvers, who, it must be owned, are a very novel class, and have a very peculiar duty of purification and atonement to perform, as a prelude to the absolution they are to give the monarch. One of this number remains after the rest had retired, who soon discovers himself to be General Washington, and makes a long speech to his Majesty, in which he states and settles the account

Southey's Vision of Judgement.

between them in respect to the grounds and motives of their long contest upon earth. In the end, the Monarch and the Patriot General amicably resolve that no manner of blame is imputable to either; the General first asserting his own innocence, and then proclaiming his old opponent to be equally void of offence. The King, in his turn, gives the champion of American independence a similar release and discharge from all debts, trespasses, claims, challenges, and demands whatsoever, from the beginning of the world, and through all eternity, any statute or ordinance, divine or human, to the contrary thereof in anywise notwithstanding.

Washington retires, and the King of England being called upon to speak for himself, gives an account of his deeds done in the flesh, in which he stands upon the following pleas:

"King of England, speak for thyself! here is none to arraign thee. Father, he replied, from whom no secrets are hidden, What should I say! Thou knowest that mine was an arduous station, Full of cares, and with perils beset. How heavy the burthen Thou alone canst tell! Short-sighted and frail hast thou made us, And thy judgments who can abide? But as surely Thou knowest The desire of my heart hath been alway the good of my people, Pardon my errors, O Lord, and in mercy accept the intention! As in Thee I have trusted, so let me not now be confounded!" (p. 26.)

The Beatification then proceeds in the following manner; for Mr. Southey stops at nothing:

"Bending forward he spake with earnest humility: Well done, Good and faithful servant! then said a Voice from the Brightness, Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.—The ministring Spirits Clapt their pennons therewith, and from that whole army of Angels Songs of thanksgiving and joy resounded, and loud hallelujahs; While on the wings of Winds uprais'd, the pavilion of splendour Where inscrutable light enveloped the Holy of Holies, Moved, and was borne away, thro' the empyrean ascending.

"Beautiful then on its hill appear'd the Celestial City, Soften'd, like evening suns, to a mild and bearable lustre. Beautiful was the ether above; and the sapphire beneath us, Beautiful was its tone, to the dazzled sight as refreshing As the fields with their loveliest green at the coming of summer, When the mind is at ease, and the eye and the heart are contented.

"Then methought we approach'd the gate. In front of the portal, From a rock where the standard of man's Redemption was planted, Issued the Well of Life, where whosoever would enter, So it was written, must drink, and put away all that is earthly. Earth among its gems, its creations of art and of nature, Offers not aught whereto that marvellous Cross may be liken'd Even in dim similitude, such was its wonderful substance. Pure it was and diaphanous. It had no visible lustre;

Yet from It alone whole Heaven was illuminate alway;
Day and Night being none in the upper firmament, neither
Sun nor Moon, nor Stars; but from that Cross as a fountain
Flow'd the Light uncreated; light all-sufficing, eternal,
Light which was, and which is, and which will be, for ever and ever;
Light of light, which, if daringly gazed on, would blind an Archangel,
Yet the eye of weak man may behold, and beholding is strengthened.
Yea, while we wander below, opprest with our bodily burthen,
And in the shadow of death, this Light is in mercy vouchsafed us,
So we seek it with humble heart; and the soul that receives it
Hath with it healing and strength, peace, love, and life everlasting.

"Thither the King drew nigh, and kneeling he drank of the water.
Oh what a change was wrought! In the semblance of age he had risen,
Such as at least he appear'd, with the traces of time and affliction
Deep on his faded form, when the burthen of years was upon him.
Oh what a change was wrought! For now the corruptible put on
Incorruption; the mortal put off mortality. Rising
Rejuvenescent he stood in a glorified body, obnoxious
Never again to change, nor to evil and trouble and sorrow,
But for eternity form'd, and to bliss everlasting appointed." (p. 26-29.)

We have then a section describing the meeting of beatified
sovereigns, to whom George the Third is introduced; his en-
trance being announced in the following strains:

"Lift up your heads, ye gates; and ye everlasting portals,
"Be ye lift up! for lo! a glorified monarch approacheth."

In this community of sovereigns are William the Third, Eli-
zabeth, Charles the First, Edward the Sixth, the hero of Cressy,
"in arms and in courtesy peerless," the lion-hearted Richard,
too, whose soul the poet tells us would not have been there
but that

"Friendship, disdain of wrong, and generous feeling redeemed it."

In addition to which, we are reminded of two other indisputable
claims possessed by this warrior king,

"Magnanimity there had its seat, and the love of the muses."

Beings, as it would appear, not only recognized, but much made
of in this poetical heaven. The spirits, too, of the Saxon kings
"who founded our laws and our temples," with Alfred in his
due pre-eminence of bliss, are not forgotten by Mr. Southey.
Again, in the 9th section, the proclamation is renewed,

"Lift up your heads, ye gates; and ye everlasting portals,
"Be ye lift up."

And a train of British worthies of the olden time present them-
selves as the inhabitants of the blessed city.—Friar Bacon, and
Chaucer, and Shakspeare, and Spenser, and Milton, and Taylor,
and Cranmer, and Cecil, and Marlborough, and Newton and
Berkeley.

Next come the worthies of the Georgian age, to whom the 10th section is devoted; Wolfe, and Cook, and Handel, and Mansfield, and Burke, and Hastings, and Cowper, and Nelson, and Wesley, and Hogarth;—an eminent group, no doubt, but a little motley in their intermixture; and one can scarcely subdue an inclination to smile at a part of the selection, and the collocation of names. To the same happy abode the poet has also consigned some of the younger luminaries of the same age; and first in order those whom in the battles of Nelson and Wellington the sword arrested in the flower of their prime. Nor does the poet fail to enumerate, with a poet's sympathy, the young favourites of the *muses*, “with dew from Castalia sprinkled,” Chatterton, and Russell, and Bampfylde, and Henry Kirke White; having unhesitatingly determined that the suicide of the first-named was an act of madness, and could not “for guilt be accounted.”

The 12th and last section, which again begins with opening the everlasting portals, is denominated “The Meeting;” by which is meant the joyful congression of dear friends and relatives restored to each other in this mansion of the blessed, and principally of our late good old King, and those of his family who have departed this life. The late Princess Charlotte and the Princess Amelia are the chief figures in this happy group; and the bliss of the parent King is complete. Mr. Southey wakes, and releases his reader, on the point of falling asleep likewise.

Such is the plan of this singular performance, the *Vision of Judgement*!—a plan which appears to us to have been miserably conceived and woefully executed. This great and terrible day of the Lord is not to be tampered with. It is ill calculated to amuse our vacant hours. Every effort to bring the subject nearer to us, appears to exalt it still farther above our reach. A solemn general anticipation, indeed, of a final sentence to be pronounced upon us by “the blessed and only Potentate,” the most righteous and merciful Judge of quick and dead, the Sovereign Disposer of all things,—such as it is revealed to us in Scripture by vivid and momentary glances, as heaven's chambers are opened when the lightning lifts up the curtain of the night,—at once elevates and chastens the soul, strengthens it with holy hope, and shakes it with salutary terror: but any attempt at detail or formal description, on such a subject, can produce only a debasing effect on the mind; and by the necessary assemblage of incongruous and disproportioned ideas, associates with that which alone in its incomparable glory veils itself in awful general and ineffable splendour—an object that borders upon profaneness, and puerility. Thus it appears to us that nothing can well exceed in absurdity the 10th section of this

poem, in which the worthies of the Georgian age are represented as coming forth to welcome their sovereign. The reader shall have the specimen produced to him, in which he will not fail to observe with what learned and sonorous effect geography is brought in aid of this foreign metre, and to compare with the "Vallombrosa," and "El Dorado," and "Golden Chersonese" of Milton, the "Germany," "Belgium," and above all the "Owhyhee" of Mr. Southey.

"These with a kindred host of great and illustrious spirits
Stood a part, while a train whom nearer duty attracted
Thro' the Gate of Bliss came forth to welcome their Sovereign.
Many were they and glorious all. Conspicuous among them
Wolfe was seen: And the seaman who fell on the shores of Owhyhee,
Leaving a lasting name, to humanity dear as to science:
And the mighty musician of Germany, ours by adoption,
Who beheld in the King his munificent pupil and patron.
Reynolds, with whom began that school of art which hath equall'd
Richest Italy's works, and the masterly labours of Belgium,
Came in that famous array: and Hogarth, who followed no master,
Nor by pupil shall e'er be approach'd, alone in his greatness.
Reverend in comely mien, of aspect mild and benignant,
There, too, Wesley I saw and knew, whose zeal apostolic,
Tho' with error alloy'd, hath on earth its merited honour,
As in Heaven its reward. And Mansfield the just and intrepid;
Wise Judge, by the craft of the Law ne'er seduced from its purpose;
And when the misled multitude raged like the winds in their madness,
Not to be moved from his rightful resolves. And Burke I beheld there;
Eloquent statesman and sage, who, tho' late, broke loose from his tram-
mels,

Giving then to mankind what party too long had diverted.
Here, where wrongs are forgiven, was the injured Hastings beside him:
Strong in his high deserts, and in innocence happy, tho' injured,
He, in his good old age, outlived persecution and malice,
Even where he had stood a mark for the arrows of slander,
He had his triumph at last, when moved with one feeling, the Senate
Rose in respect at his sight, and atoned for the sin of their fathers.

"Cowper, thy lovely spirit was there, by death disenchanted,
From that heavy spell which had bound it in sorrow and darkness,
Thou wert there, in the kingdom of peace and of light everlasting.
Nelson also was there in the kingdom of peace, tho' his calling
While upon earth he dwelt, was to war and the work of destruction.
Not in him had that awful ministry deaden'd, or weaken'd
Quick compassion, and feelings that raise while they soften our nature.
Wise in counsel, and steady in purpose, and rapid in action,
Never thought of self from the course of his duty seduced him,
Never doubt of the issue unworthily warp'd his intention.
Long shall his memory live, and while his example is cherish'd
From the Queen of the Seas, the sceptre shall never be wrenched.

(pp. 36-38.)

It gives us no pleasure to criticise with severity any production of Mr. Southey's. Our language and our literature have been much indebted to him; nor has he cancelled that debt by any base sacrifices at the shrine of voluptuousness. Poetry has lost none of its dignity in his hands, and the Muse has been the handmaid of virtue. He has set up no specious crimes in the place of moral excellence, nor helped to confound the standard of right and wrong; but in this age of education and great national efforts for general improvement, he has made the most captivating of all arts administer to the same high purpose: and while the balance is trembling between the good and ill results of this rage of universal instruction, he throws the weight of his commanding genius into the scale of beneficial influence. Some of his very sweet stanzas in his "Lay of the Laureate" are still sounding in our ears, while we are paying this tribute to the merits of Mr. Southey; and, as he has in these unhappy *hexameters* introduced us to the young Princess Charlotte in the place of immortal bliss, we will set against them three beautiful stanzas taken from the publication last alluded to, wherein he points to the road which was to conduct that hope of England thither, and to make her in the mean time the source of her country's happiness, by being the pledge of security to the Church establishment:

LIV.

Built on a rock, the fabric may repel
 Their utmost rage, if all within be sound:
 But if within the gates indifference dwell,
 Woe to her then! there needs no outward wound!
 Through her whole frame benumbed, a lethal sleep,
 Like the cold poison of the asp, will creep.

LV.

In thee, as in a cresset set on high,
 The light of piety should shine far seen,
 A guiding beacon fixed for every eye:
 Thus from the influence of an honoured queen,
 As from its spring should public good proceed,—
 The peace of heaven shall be thy proper meed.

LVI.

So should return that happy state of yore
 When Piety and Joy went hand in hand,
 The love which to his flock the shepherd bore,
 The old observances which cheered the land,
 The household prayers which honouring God's high name,
 Kept the lamp trimmed, and fed the sacred flame,
 In the midst of our greatest anger, too, against Mr. Southey,
 and really he has much provoked our critical indignation by the

puerile poem, if poem it can be called, which has been the subject of this Article, we remember his Roderick with due gratitude, which for high moral sentiment, poetical diction, bold and diversified character, picturesque description, and deep and sustained interest, may challenge a comparison with the best efforts of modern genius. His great and besetting follies, as a poet, are, his innovating ambition, his disregard of models, his addiction to excess, his vanity of simplification, and his rage for retrograde reforms.

ART. X.—ON METEOROLOGY, METEOROLOGICAL INSTRUMENTS, AND THE CLIMATE OF LONDON.

1. *The Climate of London, deduced from Meteorological Observations, made at different Places in the Neighbourhood of the Metropolis.* By Luke Howard. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1818 & 1820.

2. *Description of Instruments designed for extending and improving Meteorological Observations.* By John Leslie, Esq. Professor of Natural Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh. 8vo. pp. 48. Edinburgh, 1820.

3. *Observations on the Climate of Penzance, and the District of the Land's-End in Cornwall.* By John Forbes, M.D. Secretary of the Royal Geological Society of Cornwall. 8vo. pp. 64. Penzance, 1821.

NOTWITHSTANDING the immense mass of meteorological facts recorded in the scientific journals of every country in Europe, during the last and present centuries, and the occasional collation of these by men of eminence, with the view, and often with the effect, of arriving at more general truths, it must be admitted, that the important science of Meteorology is still in its infancy. It must be allowed, however, that it has made much progress, especially during the last forty or fifty years; and that its existing condition is maturity, compared with its pristine imbecility. Like every other branch of science, it has experienced the effect of the purifying spirit diffused by the general adoption of the Baconian philosophy, and the necessary exaltation flowing from the advancement and improvement of every department of natural knowledge. For many years past the general attention of meteorologists has been directed to the faithful observation of all the known phenomena connected with this science, without any ulterior object, in general, but in amassing a stock of materials, which might furnish future

inquirers with the means of developing a theory calculated to include and explain the whole,—which might reconcile all the seeming anomalies that to them had been so perplexing, by confining within the dominion of a few simple laws the wondrous and innumerable events of which the atmosphere is the subject or the theatre. While contemplating this seemingly humble, yet truly philosophic task, which apparently brings the man of science on a level with the mere plodding annalist, we feel that there is something truly philanthropic in the humility and patience and toil, persevered in from day to day, and from year to year, with the sole aim and object of enabling some other inquirer, perhaps not yet in existence, to advance a few steps in the same useful career, and who, in his turn, will consecrate himself, voluntarily and unrepiningly, to improvements which he is never to behold, and to the fame and glory of some future genius, whose name, like another Newton's, shall eclipse all that will have gone before it in the same path. Such is the wisdom of that Providence which created and sustains both man and nature. In the succession of mind, as in the succession of the phenomena of the material universe; there is no individuality—no interruption nor repose: ~~the~~ one, since its first creation, has continued to wheel its worlds through space, and to shed upon our planet, day after day, all the ever-changing yet ever-regular phenomena of the seasons,—while, amid the mortal extinction (we speak in reference to *this world*) of individual minds, the succession of *thought* in the race of man has been equally complete and unbroken,—yielding the same contemplation and admiration and investigation of the works of God, in every successive moment of time; each individual spirit, happy in the exertion of its own energies, yet labouring unconsciously for the happiness of all that were to follow in the same career.

The mass of facts thus collected is certainly very great; sufficient perhaps, even now, to furnish the clue to the discovery of many, at least, of the laws which regulate the phenomena, when some accidental observation or discovery, in this or the collateral sciences, shall have incited some well-qualified mind to undertake the investigation. In the mean while, however, we are far from wishing to withdraw the attention of observers from their present humble task of registering experience. The Newton of meteorology is probably yet unborn; and even if he were, there can be no question that it will require the continued experience of ages to perfect a system, the mere delineation of whose outlines will be sufficient glory for any single mind.

Before entering upon the subject we have at present more immediately in view,—the analysis, namely, of the works whose titles are prefixed to this article,—we feel disposed to make a

few plain observations on the object and utility of the science itself; such as must occur to every one who considers the subject attentively,—and which, on that very account, we regard as more likely to benefit the generality of such readers as look to our periodical labours, for instruction, than the consideration and developement of scientific principles.

Meteorology is that branch of natural history which makes us acquainted with the physical qualities of the atmosphere on the surface of the earth, and with all the natural phenomena of which the atmosphere is the scene or subject; being merely a comprehensive term for all those notions signified by the words *weather*, *climate*, &c. In this point of view, it is strictly a department of natural history; but it goes beyond this simple registry of facts; and, consequently, beyond the ordinary limits usually assigned to this science; as it aspires to the philosophical investigation of the principles which regulate the occurrence, and modify the character of the phenomena with which it is conversant. The study may thus be divided into two parts,—the one purely *historical*, the other *scientific*; the one making us acquainted with the whole series of events and their relations, such as they have occurred in any one district, or country, or climate, or in all climates;—the other tracing the causes thereof. Without the knowledge of both these departments, our acquaintance with meteorology must be considered as imperfect, and the utility of it as being consequently less; yet even the simpler part of the science is of no trifling advantage, and, fortunately for us, this part of it is within the reach of all.

By considering that bountiful provision of Providence which has for ever fixed the regular succession of the phenomena of the universe,—which has decreed, that, “while the earth remaineth, seed-time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night, shall not cease,”—and thereby rendered the experience of every preceding individual and race available to the exigencies of every succeeding one,—it is obvious that even our empirical knowledge of the phenomena of the weather must be very useful to mankind.

Admitting that some very slight changes of the climate of different places may have taken place in the course of ages,—and certainly we are not warranted to admit more than this,—still it must be allowed that the *general character* of the climate of any one district or country is almost the same as it ever has been; and we are authorised by every principle, instinctive, rational, and revealed, to conclude, that the order of nature will be the same in future time, as in the present and the past. From this it follows, that if we have a thorough knowledge of all the phenomena with which, meteorology is conversant,—in

words, if we have a *true history of the weather* for any series of years, in any one spot on the earth's surface,—we have an equally certain, though much less minute, history of the years that are to come. It is indeed true, that we cannot predict with any degree of confidence, the character of any single day, or season, as to its temperature, moisture, or any other individual quality; yet, if possessed of the knowledge which meteorology, even in its present state, is capable of affording, we can assuredly predict, with the utmost confidence, the general character, in many respects, of the future year. In doing so, we are guided by the same principles which direct all scientific inquiry,—the knowledge of the *invariable sequences* among events in all time past, and the instinctive and irresistible belief, that the future order of nature will be the same as the past has been. With this knowledge, then, and on these principles, we maintain, that the meteorologist is as much entitled to expect, and consequently to predict, the future character of the seasons, as the astronomer is entitled to predict the obscuration, in eclipse, of any of the planetary bodies,—or the chemist to predict the agency of acids and alkalies not yet in action,—or the most ignorant of mankind, equally with the wisest, to predict, that the combustion of the branches that are now green around his cottage, when they shall become withered, will as certainly afford warmth (if so used) to its future inhabitants, as those which were green to his ancestors are now diffusing to him the same comfort which the hearth of other years supplied to them. On these principles, then, which cannot be disputed, we repeat, that the mere historical or empirical knowledge of meteorology must be highly useful; and it is for this reason that we are now anxious to give to the study—all we can—the aid of our humble yet most sincere recommendation. If we know, for example, that the temperature of any day, month, season, or year, has never been recorded in all time past, as above or below a certain degree, in a certain place,—are we not justified in all our speculations, projects, and plans that have regard to futurity, in considering that the temperature of all future years will be bounded by these extremes? Individual days, seasons, and years, doubtless, will vary much from the particular temperature stated, yet, unquestionably, the general or average temperature of a greater or less series of years will vary in no material proportion from that predicted. The same reasoning may be applied to the rains, winds, snows, thunders, and to every atmospheric change, with a confidence which need not alarm, and will not deceive us.

But

In all our reasoning, we take it for granted that the history of a sufficient
 time period has been recorded.

In considering these things in connexion with many of the useful arts of life, for instance, with agriculture, navigation, and medicine, the high value of even the inferior departments of the study must be self-evident. If the agriculturist could be assured that there will, either be a heavy fall of rain, or no rain at all, on a certain future day, week, or month, or that the temperature will be of a certain degree,—how much might such assurance contribute to his interest, by enabling him to arrange accordingly many of his rural plans? and how willingly, therefore, would he purchase, at a price, the knowledge that could bestow it? What would the merchant give to be able to predict the winds that are to blow in a certain tract of the ocean at a certain time? What will not the invalid give for the assurance of a change of weather that will afford him relief to-morrow? What would not the general give to foresee the weather of the succeeding week or month, in a perilous position, where the occurrence of frost and snow might probably annihilate his army; and, on the other hand, the continuance of the existing temperature and moisture would enable him to advance in triumph, or retreat at least in safety? These are strong cases purposely chosen; and we are far from wishing to assert, that the knowledge of mankind will ever enable us to see their exemplars in reality. Assuredly, at present, such nice prophecy is quite beyond our power. Yet if ever this knowledge is to be in any degree obtained, it can only be through the study of meteorology; and when we consider what a mere empirical knowledge of this science has already enabled us to do,—why should we despair of reaching heights at present unseen and un contemplated, when we shall have superadded to our present powers, the power derived from the knowledge of the principles of the science? And when we consider the advances that have been made in this very department of late years, by the perfection of instruments, the improved methods of observation, and, above all, by the better elucidation of the general laws that regulate the distribution of heat on the surface of the globe,—we feel justified in asserting, not merely that we are in the right path to the attainment of the principles of the science, but that several of the more important of these are already attained. In confirmation of this statement,—and as a justificatory argument for the warmth of our anticipations stated above,—we would here call the attention of our readers to the labours and discoveries of a few of the very latest writers on meteorology;—namely, Leslie, Humbolt, Wells, and Howard. Humbolt, in different parts of his writings, and more particularly in his late essay on *Isothermal Lines*, has gone far to arrange and explain and generalise the vast body of facts hitherto ascertained respecting the general and local causes that modify the tempera-

ture of different climates, countries, and districts. A translation of this little work has recently appeared in the Edinburgh Philosophical Journal, to which we beg to refer the English reader, as to a document that must claim and repay the attention of all future meteorologists.

To Mr. Leslie, meteorology, as a science, is still more indebted. His inquiries concerning heat, begun so many years ago, and terminating in discoveries which have thrown so much light upon various departments of science, have, in an especial manner, benefited this particular branch. For the detail and progressive development of these, we must refer to the author's various writings, more particularly to his Inquiry concerning Heat, and to the various meteorological articles furnished by him to the Supplement of the Encyclopedia Britannica. Of the practical application of some of these to the subject of this science, we shall presently take some notice, in the enumeration of the instruments necessary to the successful prosecution of meteorology. The discoveries of Dr. Wells respecting the formation of *dew*, &c. are well known, and, although mere corollaries of Mr. Leslie's more general demonstrations, they have proved a very valuable accession to the science. Of the discoveries and speculations of Mr. Howard we shall have occasion to treat largely in the sequel. In the mean while we need merely mention, that he has demonstrated the great influence of the *moon* over the general phenomena of the weather,—a fact which must, in a certain degree, give the stability of astronomical principles to some of the deductions of empirical observation.

Upon the whole, on looking back on what we have said, we are disposed to consider our most eager anticipations justified by an appeal to facts, and by the analogy of the progress of every other department of science. Who, before the birth of Newton, could have hoped to see the glories which his divine genius laid open to the common gaze of mortals? What were the powers and the value of chemistry before the time of Black and Lavoisier, compared with those it has since attained; the perfection of which we, in a great measure, owe to the genius of our man—our countryman, Sir Humphry Davy?

In looking forward to the improvement of meteorology we reckon, in no slight degree, upon the improvement of our future means of observation, through the invention of new instruments and amendment of the old. The history of astronomy and chemistry affords splendid instances of the effect of such mechanical inventions in accelerating their respective procedures; and we think no one who considers the accessions afforded to meteorology in the instruments described in the pamphlet now

before us,—and reflects, moreover, that they are all the production of a single individual,—will deny the probability, much less the possibility, of meteorology being eventually possessed of means as effective for the attainment of its objects, as those of which the two other sciences just named have long boasted.

All the instruments described by Mr. Leslie in this small work, with a single exception, are mere modifications of his Differential Thermometer,—an instrument which, for extensive range of application, has hardly a parallel. This instrument consists of a long slender glass tube, terminated at each end by a globular ball, and bent somewhat into the form of the letter U. Each ball contains common air insulated in its own proper ball by the intervention of a coloured liquid, which occupies a considerable portion of the connecting tube, and rises in some degree into one of the balls. The application of a certain degree of temperature to *one only* of these balls will, by contracting or expanding the included air, elevate or depress the coloured fluid in the opposite stem, and thus afford a measure for detecting very minute variations of temperature. By a little management, this instrument performs very different offices, and assumes, in consequence, different titles. The first modification is denominated the *Pyroscope*, and is merely the simple instrument with one of its balls covered completely with gold or silver leaf. Its principal use is to measure the intensity of a common fire, which it does by receiving the full effect of the *radiant* heat on the uncovered ball, while the other, owing to its bright metallic coating, is not at all influenced by it. The rise of the fluid in the stem connected with the covered ball is, of course, proportioned to the degree of heat projected on the instrument. The next instrument is the *Photometer*, which measures the power of *illumination*, by detecting the slight alterations of temperature which it occasions. It is the differential thermometer with one of the balls blown of black glass. This instrument enables us to compare the relative brightness of different days and seasons, or of different countries and climates, its object being to measure the quantity of indirect light reflected from the sky. This appears to be very fluctuating. Mr. Leslie says it is “most powerful when the sky is overspread with thin fleecy clouds; it is feeblest, either when the rays are obstructed by congregated vapours, or when the atmosphere is clear and of a deep azure tint.” The importance of this instrument is at once shown by the fact, now well ascertained, that the ripening of fruits and the growth of vegetables is greatly influenced by the quantity of light.

The instrument, however, of by far the greatest importance, and that which, in meteorology, must be reckoned next in value to the thermometer and barometer, is the *Hygrometer*. Of all

the numerous instruments of this kind that have been offered to the attention of meteorologists, Mr. Leslie's is unquestionably the most philosophic and most accurate, and is indeed the only one at all to be depended on. Entertaining this opinion, it is, therefore, with surprise that we still see the majority of observers continue to use De Luc's,—an instrument which, however ingenious, and however valuable at the period of its discovery, is certainly very inaccurate. We are sorry to have to charge so zealous and so accurate an observer as Mr. Howard with the general delinquency of rejecting the invention of the northern professor. Mr. Leslie's hygrometer consists of a simple differential thermometer, with one of the balls covered with tissue paper, for the reception of pure water when it is to be used. The degree of cold produced by the evaporation of the water (marked by the descent of the liquid in the opposite stem) is directly proportioned to the dryness of the air, and continues to be so under all circumstances. The only other instrument that can at all come into competition with Mr. Leslie's hygrometer, is one lately proposed by Mr. Daniell, and described in the 16th number of the *Journal of Science*. This is a more complicated instrument; but, like Mr. Leslie's (from which the design seems evidently taken), is well calculated to give much greater accuracy to our observations than had previously been attained. The principle of Mr. Daniell's hygrometer consists in the capacity to generate, at will, a sufficient degree of cold, to cause the condensation of the vapour contained in the atmosphere; which deposition will, of course, take place at a greater or less reduction of temperature, *cæteris paribus*, according to the degree of saturation of the air. One or both of these instruments we would recommend to meteorologists, as equally necessary with the thermometer and barometer. Indeed there can be now no doubt that the utility of both these will be most materially increased by the contemporaneous indications of the other. The value of the barometer, especially, will be heightened by its combined use, not merely as an indicator of the weather, but even as the means of determining altitudes. In medicine, also, the importance of a true hygrometer must be very great, and as such we consider both Mr. Leslie's and Mr. Daniell's.*

* Mr. Daniell's instrument contains vaporised ether in place of common air; and we observe, that the same substance has been adopted to give greater sensibility to Mr. Leslie's differential thermometer, and its various modifications. See *Journal of Science*, No. xvi.

A substantial objection to Mr. Daniell's hygrometer that occurs to us, is of fixing the exact degree of temperature at which the deposition conceives the descent of the thermometer must be often so rapid, that it is not possible to ascertain the actual vapour point before time has been allowed for the change to be perceived. For instance, if the vapour point is 40°, and the

The last modification of the differential thermometer proposed by Mr. Leslie is the *Æthrioscope*, which is merely the *Pyroscope* already described, so varied as to be free from the influence of light and wind during its employment. Its use is to measure the degrees of cold shot down from the upper atmosphere, which it does by being simply exposed under the open sky. This singular fact of the projection of cold (*cold pulses*, according to the theory of Mr. Leslie) from the upper atmosphere to the surface of the earth, is one of the many discoveries for which science is indebted to Mr. Leslie. The effect is observable at all times, by day and night, and is found to vary exceedingly. It is greatest while the sky has the pure azure hue; it diminishes fast as the atmosphere becomes obscured with clouds; and it is almost extinguished by low fogs. The knowledge of this curious fact throws great light on many processes in meteorology; as, for instance, the formation of dew, hoar frost, ice, &c.; explains many seeming anomalies relative to temperature, as indicated by the thermometer, and suggests new cautions to be attended to in placing this instrument out of doors. As it is the comparative temperature of the superior strata of our atmosphere that the *æthrioscope* indicates, it seems very probable that, by its means, we may be enabled to detect the existence of elevated currents long before they make their appearance at the surface, and may thus obtain a new, powerful, and very unexpected accession to our existing means of ascertaining the changes of the weather. We have little doubt that it will be found, as Mr. Leslie conjectures, that the northern winds will shoot down colder impressions than those from the opposite quarter.

The last instrument described by Mr. Leslie is the *Atmometer*, whose office is to measure the degree of evaporation, or quantity of moisture exhaled from a humid surface in a given time. This instrument consists of a ball of porous earthen ware, to which is affixed and closely cemented, a rather wide glass tube, open at top, but with the means of being closely stopped. The tube, which is graduated according to the superficial extent of the porous ball, is filled with water, and exposed to the free action of the air. The humidity transudes through the earthen ware, just as fast as it is evaporated from the surface, and the waste is, of course, measured by the descent of the water in the stem. By means of two instruments of this kind (one sheltered and one exposed) or by the conjoint observation of a hygrometer and atmometer, we can ascertain the velocity of the wind in a very accurate manner. At a temperature of the atmosphere 45°, a rapid evaporation of the water instantly reduces the sentient ball to several degrees below 40°; and that the apparent point of condensation will be 4° beyond the true.

accurate manner. While upon the subject of instruments, we had intended to make some observations upon the employment of the common thermometer and the rain gauge. We find, however, that we cannot enter upon this subject at present. We will merely in this place express our regret, that there is so little union among observers; and, in consequence, such discrepancies in the time, mode, and circumstances of observation. Among all the scientific institutions which this country can boast, it is singular that there is none for the exclusive cultivation of meteorology. Were such a society to have no other effect but to regulate, by one common standard, the kind of instruments to be used, and the period and mode of observation to be followed by all the members, it would be of most important benefit to the science.

With these remarks upon the general subject of meteorology, which have grown to an extent we did not contemplate, but which, we trust, will not be deemed altogether misplaced, nor be found entirely useless,—we proceed to fulfill our original intention, namely, to lay before our readers a simple and faithful sketch of the *Climate of London*, as detailed in the valuable work of Mr. Howard. In this task, should we appear to some to be too prolix, we must appeal for our excuse to the great importance of the subject, and to the nature of the publication; which is only likely to be studied by the professed meteorologist.

Among the numerous cultivators of meteorology in the present day, Mr. Howard has long been conspicuous for his unwearied industry in recording facts, and for the acuteness and intelligence he has brought to bear on the general subject of the science. In the present volumes he has collected from different publications, a continued series of monthly tables of the weather (which he had himself originally communicated) from the year 1807 to 1819, both inclusive. These, and their numerous annotations, which together exhibit a faithful and minute record of the weather as observed in the vicinity of London, fill the whole of the first volume and part of the second. The greater portion of the latter volume is occupied, in the first place, with the review, arrangement, and generalization of the vast body of facts contained in the first part of the work,—in other words, with the exposition of the true character of the *climate of London*, as deduced from observation; and, secondly, with a detail of principles, speculations, and opinions, respecting meteorology in general, which appear to the author to be warranted by the facts which, at least, seem to him worthy of being subject of consideration of scientific men.

In this work we shall follow the arrangement of the author, and accordingly advert, in the first place,

to the important subject of *temperature*. It is scarcely necessary to state, that the source of atmospheric temperature is the sun, and that, generally speaking, the mean temperature of any place on the earth's surface is proportioned to its distance from the equator, or mean station of the sun's path in the ecliptic. The temperature is greatest at that point, and lessens progressively as we approach towards the poles on either side. Were the ecliptic, or sun's path, coincident with the equator, there would be no variation of temperature in any one place throughout the year, any more than, in the same case, there would be variation in the length of the day:—In other words, there would be no change of seasons. By the actual arrangements of the planetary system, however, while the mean annual or average temperature of any spot on the earth's surface remains the same, the daily and monthly temperature varies very much in the different seasons,—being greatest when the sun is in that part of his path most nearly vertical to us, and least when he is in the opposite extreme of the ecliptic. This is the general fact; but we shall presently see that, in temperate climates at least, this general, or, as it may be named, astronomical law of temperature, is modified in a very considerable degree by causes operating at the earth's surface. The chief of these are explained by Mr. Howard, in a way so simple and satisfactory, that we shall quote his words:—

“The heat existing from day to day in the portion of our atmosphere next the earth, is at no time the simple product of the direct action of the sun's rays on that portion. It has been found by experiments, carefully conducted, that the direct action of the sun's rays, in a calm air, will raise the thermometer an equal number of degrees, whether the time be the summer or the winter solstice. It is therefore probable, that the mass of the air is similarly affected, and that the proportion of heat which it derives from the direct passage of the rays is the same in all seasons. The accumulation of heat near the surface of the earth, which we always experience from continued sunshine, is evidently due to the stopping of the rays at that surface; to their multiplied reflexions and refractions, in consequence of which they are as it were absorbed and fixed, for a time, in the soil and in the incumbent atmosphere. By this process the earth, when in a cold state at the end of winter, becomes gradually heated to a certain depth as the warm season advances. On the other hand, when the sun declines, in autumn, the soil thus heated acts as a warm body on the atmosphere, and gives out again the heat it has received.” (Vol. ii. pp. 131, 132.)

“Were it not for this effect on the part of the earth,” Mr. Howard continues, “the heat indicated by the thermometer would, probably, on a long average (to obviate the remaining irregularities caused by clouds, rain, wind, and evaporation), be precisely at its maximum, and

minimum at the solstices, and at the mean at the equinoxes. For the power of the sun is proportionate to the quantity of parallel rays falling on a given area of the earth's surface. And this quantity is greatest when they are vertical, and diminishes as they become more oblique; till in a perfectly horizontal position of the rays it is null."

From these causes it results, that the maximum and minimum temperatures of our climate, in place of coinciding with the solstices, are removed to a whole month after these; and in like manner, the mean temperature of the year is developed about a month after either equinox. In consequence of this fact, which is fairly deduced from actual observation, Mr. Howard is led to propose a *new division of the seasons*, which, assuredly, is more consonant with the actual phenomena on the earth's surface amid which we live, than the present, which has regard only to the *remote causes* of temperature, and not to the actual temperature which exists around us, and which, it must be admitted, is the prime agent in the production of all the events by which we distinguish and denominate the seasons. This natural division is effected by "removing the beginning of the seasons fifteen days from their respective present situations, and placing them at that distance *before the equinoxes and solstices.*"

By this arrangement,

"*Spring* will begin the 6th of March, at the temperature (for London) of $39\cdot94^{\circ}$, will occupy 93 days, and end on the 6th of June at the temperature of $58\cdot08^{\circ}$ —the temperature having risen $18\cdot14$

"*Summer* will begin on the 7th June, and will last 93 days; during which space the mean temperature (of London) will have risen from $58\cdot08^{\circ}$ to $64\cdot75^{\circ}$, or $6\cdot67^{\circ}$, and have declined again $6\cdot59^{\circ}$.

"*Autumn*, beginning on the 8th September, at $58\cdot16^{\circ}$, will have 90 days; during which the mean temperature will have declined $18\cdot35^{\circ}$.

"*Winter*, comprehending 89 days (or in leap years 90) will begin December the 7th—During this season the mean diurnal temperature having fallen $5\cdot36^{\circ}$ (to $34\cdot45^{\circ}$, viz) will have again risen $5\cdot49^{\circ}$, or to $39\cdot94^{\circ}$ on the 5th of March, the concluding day of the season." (Vol. ii. p. 130.)

Before proceeding to lay before our readers the general facts regarding temperature, adduced by Mr. Howard, we must notice the singular, and, we confess, to us, unexpected circumstance stated by him, of the temperature of the air in London being raised, by the artificial sources of heat existing in it, *two degrees*, on the annual mean, above that of the immediate vicinity. This conclusion has been deduced, by Mr. H. from comparing his own observations made at *Plaistow, Stratford, and Tottenham* (all within four miles of London,) with those recorded in the *Philosophical Transactions* for thirty years, and were made at the apartments of the Royal Society in

London. Mr. Howard's explanation of this singular difference is the following:

"That the superior temperature of the bodies of men and animals is capable of elevating, in a small proportion, the mean heat of a city or populous tract of country in a temperate latitude, is a proposition which will scarcely be disputed. Whoever has passed his hand over the surface of a glass hive, whether in summer or winter, will have perceived how much the little bodies of the collected multitude of bees are capable of heating the place that contains them. But the proportion of warmth which is produced in a city by the population, must be far less considerable than that which emanates from fires, the greater part of which are kept up for the very purpose of preventing the sensation attending the escape of heat from our bodies. A temperature equal to that of *spring* is hence maintained, in the depth of winter, in the *included* part of the atmosphere, which, as it escapes from the houses, is constantly renewed: another and more considerable portion of heated air is constantly poured into the common mass from the chimneys; to which, lastly, we have to add the heat diffused in all directions from the founderies, breweries, steam-engines, and other manufacturing and culinary fires." (Vol. ii. p. 104.)

To these direct additions of extraneous heat, Mr. H. adds the augmentation derived, in summer, from the accumulation of the natural temperature by the artificial condition of the city.

"Several causes may be supposed to contribute to this: the country presents for the most part a plain surface, which radiates freely to the sky,—the city, in great part, a collection of vertical surfaces, which reflect on each other the heat they respectively acquire; the country is freely swept by the light winds of summer,—the city, from its construction, greatly impedes their passage, except at a certain height above the buildings: the country has an almost inexhaustible store of moisture to supply its evaporation,—that of the city is very speedily exhausted, even after heavy rain." (Vol. ii. p. 106.)

From these, and other considerations, Mr. Howard seems perfectly justified in considering the actual temperature of London, as ascertained by the thermometer, to be considerably greater than the natural temperature of the locality, had no city existed there. And he further thinks that the relative proportions which the actual temperatures of London and the immediate vicinity bear to each other, in the different portions of the diurnal period, and in the different seasons of the year, afford very satisfactory evidence that the artificial and accidental causes to which he attributes the superior temperature of the city, are the true ones. The excess of the city temperature is least in spring and greatest in winter; and seems to belong entirely "to the *nights*, which average three degrees and seven-tenths warmer than the country, while the heat of the *days*, owing without doubt to the interception of a portion of the solar

rays by a constant veil of smoke, falls, on a mean of years, about a third of a degree short of that on the open plain." (P. 289.) The following is the proportional superiority of the London temperature in the twelve different months, beginning with January, viz. $\frac{1}{7}$, $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{3}$, $\frac{1}{3}$, $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{8}$, $\frac{1}{8}$, $\frac{1}{3}$, $\frac{1}{8}$, $\frac{1}{8}$, $\frac{1}{8}$.

The only remark we would make on these statements of Mr. Howard is this, that although the indications of the thermometer, even in the most favourable position in London, may be such as he describes, we are not quite sure that it follows, that the real temperature of the atmosphere corresponds with these. By the artificial and accidental sources of heat, already mentioned, there can be no question that the whole *structural mass* of London must be always of a temperature above the mean of the surrounding atmosphere; and when we look to the laws which regulate the radiation of caloric, it must appear scarcely possible so to insulate a thermometer in the middle of the vast metropolis, as to remove it from the influence of a temperature artificially raised, and projected through the atmosphere (without heating it) from the buildings, pavement, and even from the columns of smoke, and heated air, that arise from the chimneys into the upper atmosphere.* The consequence of this must be, we think, that the temperature indicated by the thermometer in London will be always greater than that of the mass of air in which the instrument is placed, and which supplies the respiration of those who perambulate the streets.

This conjecture, whether true or false, will not, in the slightest degree, affect the facts stated by Mr. Howard respecting the *real or natural temperature* of London, to the consideration of which we now proceed.

The mean temperature of London is $48\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ of Fahrenheit, or about two degrees less than has usually been supposed. This mean temperature varies in different years as much as $4\frac{1}{2}$ degrees, and the variations, according to Mr. Howard, are periodical, and appear to recur in cycles of seventeen years. We cannot afford space for the detail of the circumstances which lead our author to form this opinion. We extract from the *summary* of the work an abridged enunciation of the alleged fact:

"We may consider one of these cycles as commencing either with 1790 or 1800, and ending with 1806 or 1816. In either case, a year of mean temperature begins the cycle, in which the *coldest* year falls at the end of ten years, and the *warmest* at the end of seven years, reckoning from the coldest, and thus alternately; both together including a complete revolution of mean temperature from its highest to its lowest extreme, (or *vice versa*, from the lower to the higher,) and

* See Leslie on Climate: Supplement to Encyclopædia Britannica.

back again. The year 1816, which was the coldest of a cycle, appears to have had parallels in 1799 and 1782; and there is every reason to conclude, from present appearances, that the warm temperature of 1806 will re-appear in 1823, which will probably be the warmest, and 1833 the coldest, upon the whole year, of a cycle of seventeen years, beginning with 1807." (Vol. ii. p. 289.)

Why has not Mr. Howard extended his inquiries further back, with the view of ascertaining the applicability of his system to a much longer series of years?

The greatest heat to which the climate of London is liable is 96° ; the greatest cold is -5° ; thus the full range of the thermometer is not less than 100° . A temperature above 80° is almost always followed, either in our own or the neighbouring districts, by thunder storms, which, in their turn, are succeeded by rain and a reduction of heat. Owing to our insular situation, and other causes, "even in the coldest season of the year, the medium of the twenty-four hours, upon a long average, does not fall below the freezing point. Continued frost, in winter, is therefore always an exception to the general rule of the climate." (p. 292.) The following is the mean temperature of the different months, in whole numbers, in the vicinity of London: January 34° , February 39° , March 41° , April 46° , May 55° , June 58° , July 62° , August 61° , September 56° , October 50° , November 40° , December 37° .—The mean annual range is 72° . The mean diurnal range, or difference between the day and night is 14° ; and this varies in the different months as follows, beginning with January, 8° , 10° , 12° , 15° , 17° , 18° , 17° , 17° , 16° , 13° , 10° , 8° .

In estimating the mean height of the barometer, Mr. Howard takes the result of twenty years at Somerset House, viz. 29.823 inches. The other results respecting the pressure of the atmosphere, which we are now briefly to enumerate, are derived from his own ten years' observation. The mean of the greatest elevations of the mercury in each month for the ten years, is 30.305; and of the greatest depressions 29.188. The mean of the maxima of each year is 30.555, and of the minima 28.557. The mean annual range is therefore 1.998 inches. The extreme range in the ten years is 2.49. The greatest elevation in the ten years occurred on 24th February, 1808, viz. 30.71; and the greatest depression on 29th January, 1814, viz. 28.22. The former condition took place during a moderate N. E. wind, and the latter during strong southerly gales. We conclude this brief notice of the atmospheric pressure with the following remarks on the indications of the barometer, which cannot fail to be valued by every one who considers their truly practical origin.

"The terms *fair*, *changeable*, *rain*, &c. at present commonly attached to certain points of the scale, are misplaced, as far as

London, and other places near the sea-level. The true *medium* of elevations and depressions for these, appears to be very near to 29·75 inches. This part of the scale, therefore, and not 29·50, as at present, should be marked *changeable*. Half an inch above it, or 30·25, may be designated *fair*; and the same distance below, or 29·25, *stormy*. Rain is most plentiful, and thunder most frequent, while the quicksilver fluctuates *about the changeable point*, or between that and the stormy one. In proportion as the quicksilver advances from the changeable towards the *fair* point, the probability of fair weather increases: at or beyond that point, it is extreme; and it decreases as the quicksilver recedes again. In proportion as the quicksilver falls from the changeable towards the *stormy* point, the probability of a storm of wind increases: at or below that point it is extreme: and the rising again of the quicksilver is not to be regarded as indicative of more settled weather, until it has again passed the changeable point. Sudden considerable changes, in either direction, are commonly followed by fair or foul weather equally transient; while a steady rise from day to day, of a tenth or so in the 24 hours, or a prolonged fall in the same proportion, (either of them passing the changeable point,) may generally be trusted as prognostics of continued rain or fair weather." (Vol. ii. p. 154.)

Of the winds. "1. A wind from the North, or between that and East, prevails on an average ~~of~~ out of 365 days; the greatest amount of its number being 96, the least 58, days. 2. A wind from East to South, 54 days, varying in different years from 72 to 54 days. 3. A wind from South to West, 104 days, varying from 123 to 78 days. 4. A wind from West to North, 100 days, varying from 124 to 83 days. 5. Variable winds obtain about 33 days, or the remainder of the year, their number being from 51 to 17 days." (Vol. ii. p. 157.)

Dividing these into two great divisions towards the E. and W. we have 140 Easterly and 225 Westerly winds; and dividing them, in like manner, towards the N. and S. we have 192 Northerly, and 173 Southerly winds. The prevailing winds in the different seasons (according to the division of Mr. Howard) are the following: In the beginning and end of *winter*, South and West; in the middle, North. In *spring*, North-east during the first two thirds; and Southerly during the remainder. In *summer*, the predominating winds are those which range from the West to North, the latter point not being included. In *autumn* the winds from S. to W. prevail throughout the season.

Next follow in order, in our author's treatise, the details respecting *evaporation*, *moisture* as indicated by the *hygrometer*, and *dew*, all of which we are constrained to pass over without further notice, in order to make room for the more interesting and important consideration of *rain*. To this part of his subject Mr. Howard seems to have paid much attention, and the section on the *causes* of this precipitation is marked, at once, by great ingenuity and cautious reasoning. In proceeding to esti-

make the actual fall of rain, he is naturally led to the consideration of the long-established fact, that rain-gauges placed at different heights, in the same place, indicate a very different proportion of rain. With the view of determining the circumstances in which this phenomenon occurred, and probably its causes, Mr. Howard instituted a set of experiments, continued through twenty successive days of wet weather, with gauges placed at different heights. These experiments, which we have not room to give in detail, led him to conclude "that, when rain takes place with a turbid atmosphere, a considerable and variable proportion of the water is actually separated from the vaporous medium, at a height not exceeding 50 feet, and that this portion consequently *must* be deficient in the upper gauge. But in showers from an elevated region, falling through an air which is not itself undergoing decomposition, the products ought to be (as is the case in some instances) alike in both gauges." P. 181. And he states the additional portion of water thus formed near the surface as sufficient to make the rain collected on the ground, to bear a proportion to that collected at the height of 40 or 50 feet, of 37 to 28, or about *one third more*. And this correction is assumed by Mr. Howard in his estimation of the actual fall of rain *at the surface*, from the admeasurements of gauges placed on the top of buildings. This is a very important fact; and not only is calculated to affect many of our reasonings in meteorology, but to be made subservient to the improvement of different processes in the arts, which we need not here advert to.

The average annual amount of rain in London is somewhat more than 25 inches, and this quantity is distributed throughout the year in the following proportions: Jan. 1·95, Feb. 1·48, March 1·29, April 1·69, May 1·82, June 1·92, July 2·63, Aug. 2·12, Sept. 1·92, Oct. 2·52, Nov. 2·99, Dec. 2·42.—The following years have been the wettest of the series (23 years), and in the order in which they are put down, viz. 1816, 1797, 1807, 1802; and it further appears that "the warm years were uniformly dry, or below the average in rain, and the cold years uniformly wet, or above the average." The proportion of rain by day and night is very different, being no less than one-third more in the latter period,—a general fact which we have ourselves verified in a very different part of the kingdom, and which is, doubtless, a beneficent arrangement of that same Providence which has appointed the day for labour and the night for repose. The greatest quantity of rain collected in one diurnal space was 2·05 inches, on 26th June, 1816. The average number of days on which any rain falls is 148,—an immense proportion, and strikingly exhibiting the wetness of our insular climate. In con-

considering the comparative humidity of different months and seasons, our author very judiciously notices the popular adage of "Forty days' rain after St. Swithin," (15th July,) and comes to the conclusion, that, although the notion will be found fallacious, if put to the test of experience at *any one station* in our island; yet that, "in a majority of our summers, a showery period, which, with some latitude as to time and local circumstances, may be admitted to constitute daily rain for 40 days, does come on about the time indicated by this tradition." The fact itself is accounted for by the proximity of the summer solstice; as the second rainy period of the year is accounted for by the proximity of the winter solstice. In respect of the influence of particular winds in causing rain, Mr. Howard shows, by calculation, what was before generally known by common observation, that North-east winds are our dry-weather winds, and South-east our wet. The winds from West to North are, also, more or less connected with our fair weather, while those between the South and West have no decided connexion with either wet or dry weather. These remarks, be it recollected, are intended to apply only to London and its vicinity, or, at most, to the central parts of the island; the influence of the particular winds in the south-western extremity of Great Britain is very different. In proof of what we have just stated respecting the winds in the vicinity of London, we may observe, from our author, that in the three dry years, 1807, 1808, and 1815, the proportion of North-easterly to South-easterly winds was nearly double, being 211 of the former, to 108 of the latter: while, in the wet years, 1810, 1812, 1814, and 1816, the proportion of the former to the latter was only as 323 to 269. In the wettest year of the series (1816) the South-easterly winds actually *exceeded* those from the North and East.

There appears to be one universal cause of rain, viz. depression of the temperature of the vapour contained in the air. This depression may take place from many causes, and may, consequently, be more or less general, or partial only. The whole mass of the atmosphere, over any particular district, may have its temperature comparatively depressed by flowing in mass from the southward, and thus leaving the influence of the sun behind it; or by being left to cool in its present position, when the sun leaves one side of the equator for the other, as is the case with this part of the globe in autumn. In both these cases the precipitation of rain will be general, and throughout the whole mass of the atmosphere on the surface of the particular district. This fact is well exemplified by the continuous misly season of winter in the south-western counties; during the prevalence of the South-west winds. A second, and more partial

cause of rain, is when a single current of air from a southern latitude flows into a northern one. In this case there are, generally, heavy showers falling from a great height. Two opposite currents from the North and South may directly meet, or they may rise each other, in their respective progress, "the colder running in laterally under the warmer current, and causing it to flow over laterally in its turn." In the former case, there will probably be only rain of short continuance, one of the currents soon obtaining the mastery; in the other case, "the country for a considerable space, extending from about the line of their junction far into the southerly current, may be the seat of extensive and continued rain."—Mr. Howard combats, and, we think, successfully, the opinion of Dr. Hutton respecting the causes of rain. The Doctor's theory may, no doubt, be true in certain cases, (as, for instance, in the one just mentioned,) but cannot apply as a general explanation of the phenomenon. In further explanation of the above statements, we shall conclude this part of our subject with a few extracts, which our readers will find to be good illustrations of the nature, as well as of the importance, of the science.

"When after a suffocating heat with moisture, and the gradual accumulation of thunder-clouds, followed by discharges of electricity, I observe a kind of icicles falling from the clouds, then large hail, and finally rain; and when after this I perceive a cold Westerly or Northerly wind prevail, I have a right to infer that the latter, aided by the electrical energies, has been acting as a cold body in mass, in a sudden and decided manner, on the warm air in which I was placed before the storm. Again, when after a cold dry North-east wind I behold the sky clouded, and feel the first drops of rain warm to the sense; and, after a copious shower, perceive the air below changed to a state of comparative warmth and softness, I may with equal reason conclude, that the Southerly wind has displaced the Northerly; manifesting itself first in the higher atmosphere, and losing some of its water by refrigeration in the course of the change." (Vol. ii. p. 210.)

In adverting to the "apparent anomaly of a North-west wind predominating in our wettest season in summer, and a South-west during the autumnal rains," Mr. Howard observes:

"I conclude, from a careful review of the cases, that the former is not the carrier but the condenser of the vapour, which appears to be introduced, at intervals only, from the South and South-east. When the surplus vapour has been disposed of in rain on these occasions, the North-west resumes its sway, the atmosphere recovers its transparency,—*et clero cernēs silvas Aquilone moveri*, (Hing), but it is usually not long before the returning clouds indicate the near approach of a new supply of vapour."

"In the decline of the year the rain appears to originate in a somewhat different way. The great body of the atmosphere is then usually

moving with some force from South-west to North-east, while the sun is declining to the Southward. An air already turbid from beginning precipitation, is further charged below by an excess of evaporation from the agitation of much watery surface over which it passes. Every calm interval then affords its shower, followed by wind and evaporation again; and a succession of gales by night, and cloudy days, characterise the approach to the hibernal season." (Vol. ii. p. 211.)

The next subject of inquiry entered upon by our author, viz. *the influence of the moon on the state of the weather*, is certainly the most original, and probably the most important, of any in these volumes; and, after having gone so largely into the many other topics treated of, we regret that our limits oblige us to dismiss this with a much briefer notice than either its importance demands, or our own wishes prompt. The influence of the moon on the weather has been the belief of all ages, and is at the present day practically acted on by the farmer and the sailor. The true nature of that influence, however, has never, to our knowledge, been so formally or completely submitted to the ordeal of experiment and philosophical investigation, as by our author, in the volumes before us; certainly it has never been demonstrated with such clearness and minuteness.—Of his observations and discoveries we now proceed to lay a spare outline before the reader; referring for further information, on this and all the other topics touched on by us, to the work itself.

It appears that the influence exerted by the moon over the weather, is through the intermedium of the effect produced by her on the relative pressure of the atmosphere on the earth's surface. This effect of our attendant planet is precisely similar, in operation and principle, to that exerted by her over the waters of the ocean in producing the tides. The atmospheric ocean, it appears, has its tides also, and is equally subject to the varying attractions of the moon and sun, as modified by the relative position of these bodies to each other and to the earth. The effect of these attractions, however, on the atmosphere, are much less obvious and regular than on the waters of the ocean. The most striking feature of the common tides is the *diurnal* flux and reflux, which are scarcely perceivable, or, at least, only in particular situations, in the aerial ocean. The absence of this phenomenon in the air, however, (even on the admission of the moon's attraction acting similarly on the atmosphere as on the ocean,) Mr. Howard thinks may be partly explained by the difference of physical constitution in the two fluids,* and by the great effects

* "It is very probable that an interval of six hours is not nearly sufficient for the full effect of rarefaction, and still less for the subsidence and condensation of air through its whole depth to the degree required by the theory of such a (P. 219.)

produced in the former by sudden changes of temperature, causing currents. Besides, he says, a daily tide *has* been traced in very low latitudes, and he has himself met with strong indications of the same in higher latitudes. Be this as it may, we think no one who attentively peruses the work before us will entertain any doubt that the moon *does* exert an influence over the atmosphere by her attractive power, and that, through this power, she possesses a secondary, yet very considerable influence over the character of *the weather* in general, on the earth's surface. The varied effects thus produced may all be reduced to one principal source, viz. *the production of currents* in the atmosphere, which, through means of the actual and relative qualities (physical and chemical) of the air of which they are composed, give rise to the various phenomena of wind, rain, heat, &c. in those portions of the earth's surface immediately, or remotely, brought within the sphere of their operation.—In proof of the existence of such currents it will be sufficient to show the variation of pressure caused by the moon in her different phases; as currents obviously *must* follow as a consequence of this partial rarefaction of the atmospheric mass. It appears, then, from Mr. Howard's observations, that the moon's influence on our atmosphere is shown principally, in two different affections of her varied relations to it, viz: 1. As regards her position in her orbit relatively with the sun and earth together: and 2. As regards her position relatively with the earth only;—the former referring to her different *phases*, the second to her *declination*.

By comparing the results of the barometer at the different *phases*, for a period of ten years, Mr. Howard has found that the mercury “suffers a depression of about *a tenth of an inch*, by the influence of the new and full moon respectively; while, at the first and third quarters, the moon's influence is, in respect of position in her orbit, neutral, producing neither elevation nor depression in the barometer.” (P. 226.)

By comparing, in like manner, the barometric indications during different periods of the moon's *declination*, Mr. Howard ascertained that the quicksilver stands considerably *above* the mean while the moon is south of the equator, and, in a like proportion, *below* it while she is to the north of the equator. And on further examining the *temperature, winds, rain, &c.* in the different periods answering to these varied affections of the moon's path, he ascertained, as might, indeed, have been expected, that these suffered corresponding, but certainly less uniform, changes.

Without entering into the minuter details of these changes, we must content ourselves, at present, with a few observations on the more general causes of these, and we shall, with this view, for the most part make use of the words of Mr. Howard himself.

First, respecting the effect of the moon in her various phases, he shows that, with regard to temperature, there is "a system of variations governed by her attraction," as a secondary cause, subject, of course, to the more powerful influence of the sun in his declination." The precise effects, however, on the temperature, are less clearly shown than might be wished. He observes, that the elevations of the barometer and thermometer, during the same periods, are found mostly in *opposition* to each other, but at times in *conjunction*. "In the early cold periods of the year, and in the fine weather of summer, *opposition* will be found predominant; but in the decline of the year, when the atmosphere is losing both heat and water," the variations of the two instruments often correspond.

The same observation as to want of distinctness of effect in the different periods of the moon's age applies to the account given of the proportion of *rain* during the different phases. In some years the effects appear very considerable, in others less so, and in some they seem reversed. In general, however, it appears to hold, that the temperature is increased and the rain diminished during the periods of new and full moon, and the temperature lessened and the rain increased during the first and third quarters. These effects, as we have already remarked, are immediately produced by the particular classes of winds respectively prevalent in the different phases of the moon; and a reference to the connexion of the different winds with rain, noticed in a former page, will explain this fact. "Not but that there are seasons (our author observes) when the predominant solar influence is exerted to a degree which renders these Lunar changes of small consequence; and when, in spite of the various aspects of our attendant planet, we are drenched with rain or parched with drought, for months together." (P. 239.)

With respect to the different influence of the moon according to her particular *declination*, we have already noticed the effects produced on the mercury in the barometer. The following paragraph, which we select on account of its brevity, will give a slight view of the further effect of the moon's declination on *rain* and *temperature*; and also explain the author's idea of the cause of these particular effects.

"A general tendency in the Northern atmosphere to come over us (that is, to flow in mass towards the South), while the moon is far South, may be admitted as a cause why the *barometer* at this time is above the mean, the *temperature* about or below it, and the *rains* in small quantity. As the moon comes North again, the air returning from the South causes increased temperature; it brings also a great increase of vapour, and the heat evolved during the condensation of it, may possibly be the means of the greater elevation of the mean

temperature at this time in the wet, than in the dry year.* Something must, however, be attributed, in this case, to the actual translation of more of the tropical air into these latitudes in a wet season." (P. 268.)

"On the whole it may be inferred that the winds in a temperate latitude like our own, after escaping from the tropical vortex, become subject, in winter more especially, to the moon; and that their tendency is to follow her path, or the moveable point of greater rarefaction which she marks out for them." (Vol. ii. p. 276.)

The above is a brief enumeration of the principal facts observed by Mr. Howard respecting the moon's influence on the atmosphere. These, it may be thought by some, are neither so numerous nor so clear as could be wished. They are, nevertheless, highly interesting; and if the amount of their value was nothing more than that of furnishing an index and a stimulus to future inquirers, they must be considered as extremely important. So far from being disposed to comment on the paucity of facts which he has been able clearly to demonstrate, we ought to be surprised rather, in the very infancy of the study, that he has succeeded in doing so much. For, as he justly and judiciously observes, "if the moon's attraction be really the principal cause of those variations in the atmosphere which cannot be traced to the influence of the superior planet, the mode of operation of this attraction may be very simple, at the same time that, considering the complicated nature of the lunar orbit, and the perpetual interference of the sun's varying power, its manifestations in any given temperate climate may prove a very difficult subject to investigate." (P. 271.) Near the conclusion of the volume, Mr. Howard departs from his usual cautious tract of the mere generalization of facts, and, under the modest title of *conjectures*, gives a beautiful and interesting view of what he conceives to be the general theory of the winds and weather over the whole globe. To this we must be contented with simply referring the reader; and shall only mention two of these which he himself seems to regard as entirely conjectural. The first of these is the "possible case that the full moon, with a surface intensely heated by the sun, may radiate a portion of heat to the colder parts of the earth's surface towards the poles; more especially when in her extreme North and South declination; and, on the contrary, that the new moon, having become proportionally cold on the surface opposed to us, may receive by radiation from the earth, and more especially from the tropical regions, a compensating degree of heat."†

The second conjecture is, whether the fact, of that portion of

* Alluding to the years 1807 and 1816, which he had been comparing. — Raw.

† The truth or falsehood of this conjecture, we think, might easily be set at rest by an extension of Mr. Leslie's most ingenious instruments the Photometer and Actinoscope. — Rev.

the moon's disk not illuminated by the solar rays being sometimes very distinctly visible to us, and at other times not at all, when precisely in the same position, (namely in the interval between the new moon and first quarter,) may not be explained by supposing the reflexion of light from our planet (which alone can account for the effect at all) being augmented, at those particular times, by an extensive surface of snow on the Northern American continent?

Such is an imperfect outline of the valuable work of Mr. Howard; in submitting which to our readers we feel satisfied in the conviction, that our labour in its construction will be neither altogether useless to them nor to ourselves. We have presented to them in detail a vast number of highly interesting and important facts, some of which, we verily believe, point to a new and most attractive field of philosophical inquiry, fruitful in discoveries, and only awaiting the hand of cultivation. Many obvious remarks arise in our minds in contemplating the mass of information submitted to the reader;—but, while we consider the great *general value* of the work, we feel no disposition to point out trivial deficiencies, or dwell on minute errors; and the consciousness of having enriched our pages with more than a usual portion of valuable matter, furnishes us with a sufficient excuse for not enlarging further on its merits.

Just as we were about to complete the above article for our printer, by a curious coincidence we had put into our hands the little work on the *Climate of Penzance*, the title of which we have placed at the head of our review, after that of Mr. Howard's Treatise. As this publication of Dr. Forbes is strictly of that class which we have commended, viz. a faithful *history of the weather* of a particular district, deduced, by the simple process of generalization, from a long continued series of observations; and as it appears to us to be a simple and good model for the construction of such local histories, we should have willingly devoted a few of our pages to a review of it, had we not already occupied so many with the same subject. We must, therefore, content ourselves with noticing one or two particulars, which may give our readers some idea of the very peculiar climate of Penzance, and, at the same time, illustrate some of the general principles alluded to in the preceding article.

From the situation of Penzance, within a few miles of the promontory denominated the *Land's End*, which is projected, as it were, into the Atlantic from the rest of England, by the long and narrow peninsula of Cornwall, great peculiarity of climate might be expected in this district, when compared with the interior and northern counties. It must possess all the habitudes of a small island, in its own particular latitude and longitude; in

other words, it must exhibit nearly the same weather as is to be found on the surface of the neighbouring ocean.

The most striking feature of the climate of this district seems, accordingly, to be, the remarkable *equability* of its temperature. With the view of placing this in as conspicuous a light as possible, we shall here transcribe from the works of Mr. Howard and Dr. Forbes, first, the *mean temperature* of the twelve months at London and Penzance; and, secondly, the *extreme temperature* of each month for the whole series of years (viz. ten for London, and fourteen for Penzance).

1.—MEAN TEMPERATURE.

	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
London	34	39	41	46	55	58	62	61	56	50	40	37
Penzance	41	44	44	49	56	60	62	61	58	53	46	43

2.—EXTREME TEMPERATURE.*

		Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
London	{ Max.	56	57	73	80	87	88	96	83	85	73	62	56
	{ Min.	8	11	18	22	29	36	39	37	26	24	17	14
Penzance	{ Max.	56	58	62	68	74	78	78	74	68	69	58	58
	{ Min.	19	26	28	32	42	45	52	50	42	37	28	22

It appears, in like manner, from documents contained in Dr. Forbes's essay, that the temperature of Penzance retains the same proportional superiority in the colder months over all the places usually esteemed the mildest in our island; for instance, the sea coast of Devonshire, the Isle of Wight, Clifton, &c.; a fact which well accounts for, and justifies, the resort of consumptive invalids to the western extremity of Cornwall.

In thirteen years the thermometer, at 7 a. m. at Penzance, has only been thirty-seven times below the freezing point; consequently *frost* is stated to be of rare occurrence; and the exercise of *skating* entirely unknown among the young men of the place. The average number of days in the year on which *snow* falls is very little more than two and a half; and out of the fourteen years, four are recorded on which no snow fell. As the most unequivocal proofs of the peculiar mildness of the winters, Dr. Forbes, at the end of his paper, gives lists of the exotic and indigenous plants growing in the vicinity of Penzance; among which

* As the *minimum* column for Penzance gives only the minimum at 7 a. m., it will probably occasionally happen that that stated is *above* the true minimum of some of the months.

we observe several which we have never been accustomed to see beyond the walls of a green-house. Two crops of potatoes are yearly produced in the open grounds. The range of the barometer, as also its mean altitude, at Penzance, is considerably less than at London.

ART. XI.—*Memoirs from 1754 to 1758. By James Earl Waldegrave, K. G. one of His Majesty's Privy Council in the Reign of George II. and Governor to the Prince of Wales, afterwards George III.* 4to. pp. 176. Murray. London, 1821.

THE book now before us possesses intrinsic merits, which might have rendered its external decorations unnecessary. The style is extremely neat; it is even spirited and elegant; the topics which are brought forward are explained concisely; we are never encumbered either with words which are not necessary for the development of the ideas, or with ideas which are not necessary to an accurate comprehension of the subject matter. Every page bears marks of the man of good sound sense, matured by meditation, and trained in the real business of life. There is no ambition of brilliancy, or of wit, or of any species of literary ornament. The author seems to have had no object beyond that of telling what he knew in simple language; and if this simplicity is sometimes combined with keen indirect sarcasm, the infusion seems to take place almost without his consciousness.

Memoirs are a class of productions, in which our language, at least when compared with the French, is not very rich. We have never been much disposed to envy our neighbours this species of wealth; for their memoirs, in general, are little else than dull novels or duller gazettes. Even in the few works of this description, in which valuable information or skilful delineation of character is to be found, the grain is lost amid the immensity of chaff. Trifles and important transactions are detailed with equal care. Whatever was an interesting subject of conversation at the time; the anecdotes for instance, of private scandal, or the minutiae of a court ceremonial, are deemed as worthy of the attention of posterity, as events on which great systems of policy depended. The memoirs now before us are free from all such reproach; they relate exclusively to public men and public events; and treat of the one or the other, only so far as they are entitled, by having had an influence on the administration of the national concerns, to the attentive consideration of posterity.

The author of this elegant and instructive book was born on the 14th of March, 1714-15. His family connexions were originally Jacobite; for his grandfather had married a daughter of James II. by the Duke of Marlborough's sister, and had followed his sovereign into exile. But his father, having renounced the Roman Catholic Religion, was employed and trusted by Sir Robert Walpole's administration, and was Ambassador successively to the courts of Vienna and Paris; he died in 1741. The author of these memoirs, who then succeeded to the family estate and titles, did not possess the qualities which usually lead to promotion at a court. His personal appearance was unpleasant, and he was at no pains to supply, by the imperfect assistance of art, the want of those advantages which nature had refused him; his slovenly habits were frequently a theme of good-natured ridicule to his contemporaries; and he was as defective in parliamentary talent as in exterior graces. Though intimately connected with the great party leaders of the time, and conversant with political affairs, he never attempted to distinguish himself as an orator or debater. The great consideration, therefore, which he enjoyed, rested not upon any of the qualities which dazzle popular assemblies, flatter the passions of individuals, or fit the possessor for treading the mazes of secret intrigue: it was derived wholly from the general opinion that was entertained of the soundness of his understanding, the goodness of his temper, and the honourable and manly firmness of his whole character. It is no slight praise of George II. that he should have selected such a man as his confident and friend. The partiality of that monarch promoted him, in 1743, to the dignity of a Lord of the Bed-chamber; and at that time, we must recollect, such offices were much more greedily sought after, and were supposed to confer much more honour, than at present. Upon the death of Frederick Prince of Wales, he was made master of the Stannaries, and about two years afterwards was appointed governor to the young heir apparent. This was an office of unusual delicacy and difficulty; for the family of the Prince was agitated with cabals and intrigues, which had already subverted all the arrangements for his education and household, and had forced his former governor, the Earl of Harcourt, to resign. Lord Waldegrave was most unwilling to accept the charge; but the king was so urgent, that, in spite of his reluctance, he was obliged to comply. Lord Orford's account of his appointment shows what opinion was then entertained of it, and of the character of the man who was entrusted with so important a duty.

“ After long waving it, Lord Waldegrave accepted it at the earnest request of the king. The Earl was averse to it. He was a man of

pleasure, understood the court, was firm in the king's favour, easy in his circumstances, and at once undesirous of rising and afraid to fall. He said to a friend, 'if I dared, I would make this excuse to the king, — *Sir, I am too young to govern, and too old to be governed;*' but he was forced to submit. A man of stricter honour and more reasonable sense could not have been selected for the employment." (*Lord Orford's Memoirs*, vol. i. p. 255.)

At first Lord Waldegrave seems to have been on good terms with the Princess of Wales and her son. But ere long her policy led her to engage in party contests which involved her in quarrels with the king; and as Lord Waldegrave enjoyed the confidence of his royal master, and was much attached to him in return, he soon became an object of dread and dislike to her. She took for a spy, to use Horace Walpole's words, a man who would have disdained to employ one. Accordingly in 1756, Lord Waldegrave resigned, to make way for the rising star of Lord Bute. In the following year he seems to have withdrawn himself almost entirely from political affairs; and the remainder of his days were spent in the privacy of domestic life, till he was suddenly cut off by the small pox in 1763. The Memoirs which are now given to the world were composed in this period of retirement, and were evidently meant for publication. Feelings of delicacy probably prevented them from being sent to the press during the late reign.

The work professes to contain an account of our political contentions, of our party quarrels, and of all events of any consequence from the beginning of the year 1754, to the end of June 1757. It meddles, however, very slightly with foreign or military transactions. It notices the equipments of fleets, the conclusion of alliances, the results of campaigns, only cursorily: for it was plainly the writer's purpose to confine his attention to what came within his own knowledge, and to refer to other transactions, only so far as some mention of them was necessary to explain his views of our internal administration. The information contained in this book is, therefore, not only important in itself, but of a kind in which the common histories of the times are very meagre. If, for instance, we look into Smollet, we shall find who were ministers at any given date; but we shall search in vain for an account of the causes which led to that strange and apparently unaccountable dismembering of parties, and temporary union of adverse leaders, which occurred more than once in the interval between the death of Mr. Pelham, and the final coalition of Newcastle and Pitt.

These memoirs may be regarded as aiming at two objects: to portray the characters of the principal political leaders; and to explain the causes of the changes that occurred in the British

ministry during the period of which they treat. If we except a few sketches (some of them highly finished) by Lord Chesterfield and Lord Orford, the characters of the distinguished political actors towards the close of the reign of George II. have been transmitted to us by men, who knew them only by their public proceedings, and who, having no private intercourse with them, could not paint from personal observation, but were obliged to draw their pictures either from hearsay, or from the suggestions of their own imagination. It was not in their power to be accurate; and on such subjects the want of accurate knowledge is more than a merely negative disadvantage: for it gives scope for party passion and prejudice, even in the most honest hearts, to mingle unconsciously truth and falsehood together. We, therefore, attach considerable value to that part of Lord Waldegrave's work, which is occupied with delineating the characters of the most important personages among his contemporaries. The portraits are drawn with much sagacity and penetration; and there is an air of truth and of individual expression in them, which carries conviction to the mind of the reader that they are true likenesses. We have the more confidence in them as they are entirely free from antitheses and other artificial prettinesses. The author is wholly occupied with the persons whom he is describing, and never appears to be thinking of the rhetorical merit of his own composition. In works of the highest reputation we often meet with delineations of character, in which it is obvious that the writer has formed a theory concerning the views, feelings, and talents, of the individual whom he is portraying; and he gives us, of course, rather a developement of this theory, than an account of what has been known and remarked of the man. The theory may be true: but whether true or not, we may be sure that it has biassed the writer, and that it has induced him to give undue weight to some circumstances, and to overlook others, according as they squared well or ill with his preconceived notions. That simplicity of thought and expression, therefore, and that absence of ambitious effort, which we find in Lord Waldegrave's delineations of character, are something more than merely literary excellencies; they are grounds which entitle him to additional credit.

The Duke of Newcastle is one of the most extraordinary phenomena in the whole history of British ministers. His ignorance, his confusion of intellect, his notorious want of firmness and of veracity, would, one might have imagined, have excluded him from acting an important part in public affairs. Yet aided by his rank and fortune, and devoting every effort of his life to the formation of political connexions, he contrived

so to link himself with various subordinate factions, to attach to himself so numerous a band of political followers, and to bring into dependence so many men greatly his superiors in talent, and many of them his equals in rank and fortune, that for more than twenty years he was by far the most considerable subject in the kingdom, and, to use Mr. Pitt's expressive language, succeeded in an attempt which it was impossible to imagine that such a genius should conceive, an attempt to make fools of all mankind. Lord Waldegrave has painted his Grace with great truth of expression.

"The Duke of Newcastle is in his thirty-fifth year of ministerial longevity; has been much abused, much flattered, and still more ridiculed."

"Ambition, fear, and jealousy, are his prevailing passions.

"In the midst of prosperity and apparent happiness, the slightest disappointment, or any imaginary evil, will, in a moment, make him miserable: his mind can never be composed; his spirits are always agitated. Yet this constant ferment, which would wear out and destroy any other man, is perfectly agreeable to his constitution: he is at the very perfection of health, when his fever is at the greatest height.

"His character is full of inconsistencies; the man would be thought very singular who differed as much from the rest of the world as he differs from himself.

"If we consider how many years he has continued in the highest employments; that he has acted a very considerable part amongst the most considerable persons of his own time; that, when his friends have been routed, he has still maintained his ground; that he has incurred his Majesty's displeasure on various occasions, but has always carried his point, and has soon been restored both to favor and confidence; it cannot be denied that he possesses some qualities of an able minister. Yet view him in a different light, and our veneration will be somewhat abated. Talk with him concerning public or private business, of a nice or delicate nature, he will be found confused, irresolute, continually rambling from the subject, contradicting himself almost every instant.

"Hear him speak in parliament, his manner is ungraceful, his language barbarous, his reasoning inconclusive. At the same time, he labours through all the confusion of a debate without the least distrust of his own abilities; fights boldly in the dark; never gives up the cause, nor is he ever at a loss either for words or argument.

"His professions and promises are not to be depended on, though, at the time they are made, he often means to perform them; but is unwilling to displease any man by a plain negative, and frequently does not recollect that he is under the same engagements to at least ten competitors.

"If he cannot be esteemed a steady friend, he has never shewn himself a bitter enemy; and his forgiveness of injuries proceeds as much from good nature as it does from policy.

"He is not to be numbered amongst his faults ; on the contrary he deviates into the opposite extreme, and courts popularity with such extravagant eagerness, that he frequently descends to an undistinguishing and illiberal familiarity.

"Neither can he be accused of avarice, or of rapaciousness ; for though he will give bribes, he is above accepting them ; and instead of having enriched himself at the expence of his master, or of the public, he has greatly impaired a very considerable estate by electioneering, and keeping up a good parliamentary interest, which is commonly, though perhaps improperly, called the service of the crown.

"His extraordinary care of his health is a jest even amongst his flatterers. As to his jealousy, it could not be carried to a higher pitch, if every political friend was a favorite mistress.

"He is in his sixty-fourth or sixty-fifth year, yet thirsts for power in a future reign with the greatest solicitude ; and hereafter, should he live to see a Prince of Wales, of a year old, he will still look forward, not without expectation that in due course of time he may be his minister also." (P. 11—12.)

We are accustomed to complain of the corruption of our public institutions, and the degeneracy of public characters : yet is there any one who believes that such a man as this could, in the present day, retain the reins of power long in his hands?

The great Lord Chatham does not appear to so much advantage in these memoirs, as in other less authentic works.

"Mr. Pitt has the finest genius, improved by study and all the ornamental part of classical learning.

"He came early into the House of Commons, where he soon distinguished himself ; lost a cornetcy of horse, which was then his only subsistence ; and in less than twenty years has raised himself to be first minister, and the most powerful subject in this country.

"He has a peculiar clearness and facility of expression ; and has an eye as significant as his words. He is not always a fair or conclusive reasoner, but commands the passions with sovereign authority ; and to inflame or captivate a popular assembly is a consummate orator. He has courage of every sort, cool or impetuous, active or deliberate.

"At present he is the guide and champion of the people ; whether he will long continue their friend seems somewhat doubtful. But if we may judge from his natural disposition, as it has hitherto shewn itself, his popularity and zeal for public liberty will have the same period : for he is imperious, violent, and implacable : impatient even of the slightest contradiction ; and under the mask of patriotism, has the despotic spirit of a tyrant.

"However, though his political sins are black and dangerous, his private character is irreproachable ; he is incapable of a treacherous or ungenerous action ; and in the common offices of life is justly esteemed a man of veracity and a man of honor.

"He mixes little in company, confining his society to a small

juncto of his relations, with a few obsequious friends, who consult him as an oracle, admire his superior understanding, and never presume to have an opinion of their own." (P. 15, 16.)

In a conversation with the king, narrated in a subsequent page, Lord Waldegrave adds,

"That I was not ignorant that Pitt could be guilty of the worst of actions, whenever his ambition, his pride, or his resentment were to be gratified; but that he could also be sensible of good treatment; was bold and resolute, above doing things by halves; and if he once engaged, would go farther than any man in this country. Nor would his former violence against Hanover be any kind of obstacle, as he had given frequent proofs that he could change sides, whenever he found it necessary, and could deny his own words with an unembarrassed countenance." (P. 131.)

"I do not mean," says our author, "to misrepresent any man, but will make no professions of impartiality, because I take it for granted that it is not in my power to be quite unprejudiced." If prejudice was likely to sway him upon any subject, it was where the late Lord Chatham was concerned. He was the object of extreme personal dislike to George II. and therefore could not be very acceptable to that monarch's friend and favourite: and he seems to have participated in the intrigues of Leicester House, which were intended to harass and mortify the king, and to compel his friends, and Lord Waldegrave among the rest, to resign the situations which they held about the person of the young prince. Yet we doubt whether Lord Waldegrave has been led by his prepossessions to overcharge in any very considerable degree the unfavourable traits in the character of the patriot and orator. Lord Chatham's object was power: that power he meant, as all ministers in this country do, to use for the benefit of the nation; but whatever barred or impeded his progress to office, was in his eyes, inconsistent with patriotism and injurious to England's best interests, while every thing was sanctified that favoured his elevation, or contributed to render it more permanent.

The odium which has been generally attached to the name of Mr. Henry Fox, appears to have been carried greatly too far.

"As to Fox, few men have been more unpopular; yet when I have asked his bitterest enemies what crimes they could alledge against him, they always confined themselves to general accusation; that he was avaricious, encouraged jobs, had profligate friends, and dangerous connections; but never could produce a particular fact of any weight or consequence."

"His rashness or impetuosity of temper led him into two very capital mistakes; he wantonly offended the Chancellor by personal reflections or ridicule in the affair of the Marriage Act: he also in-

creased the number of his enemies by discovering an eagerness to be the minister, whilst Mr. Pelham was still alive: many of whose friends might possibly have attached themselves to him, if, instead of snatching at the succession, he had coolly waited till it had been delivered into his hands.

"He has great parliamentary knowledge, but is rather an able debater than a complete orator; his best speeches are neither long nor premeditated; quick and concise replication is his peculiar excellence.

"In business he is clear and communicative; frank and agreeable in society; and though he can pay his court on particular occasions, he has too much pride to flatter an enemy, or even a friend, where it is not necessary.

"Upon the whole, he has some faults, but more good qualities; is a man of sense and judgement, notwithstanding some indiscretion; and, with small allowances for ambition, party, and politics, is a warm friend, a man of veracity, and a man of honour." (P. 24, 25.)

There is more bitterness and sarcasm in our author's character of Lord Bute, than appears in any other part of his work. It has the air of personal hostility.

"The Earl of Bute was, at that time, a favorite of little fame; but has since merited a very uncommon reputation, and who is supposed to execute a most honorable office with great ability.

"He had been a lord of the bedchamber to the late prince; has a good person, fine legs, and a theatrical air of the greatest importance.

"There is an extraordinary appearance of wisdom, both in his look and manner of speaking; for whether the subject be serious or trifling, he is equally pompous, slow, and sententious.

"Not contented with being wise, he would be thought a polite scholar, and a man of great erudition: but has the misfortune never to succeed, except with those who are exceeding ignorant: for his historical knowledge is chiefly taken from tragedies, wherein he is very deeply read; and his classical learning extends no farther than a French translation.

"The late Prince of Wales, who was not over-nice in the choice of ministers, used frequently to say that Bute was a fine showy man, who would make an excellent ambassador in a court where there was no business. Such was his Royal Highness's opinion of the noble earl's political abilities; but the sagacity of the princess dowager has discovered other accomplishments, of which the prince her husband may not perhaps have been the most competent judge." (P. 37—39)

Instead of giving an elaborate description, Lord Waldegrave sometimes sketches a character very happily in a few words. "Lord Hardwicke," says he, "was an excellent chancellor, and might have been thought a great man had he been less avaricious, less proud, less unlike a gentleman, and not so great a politician." Again, "Sir George Lyttelton was an enthusiast, both in religion and politics, absent in business, not

ready in a debate, and totally ignorant of the world: on the other hand his studied orations were excellent; he was a man of parts, a scholar, no indifferent writer, and by far the honestest man of the whole society." (*Pitt's followers.*)

We regret that little is said of Lord Mansfield in these Memoirs. That great man, in the eye of cool reason, far superior to any of his contemporaries, was then on the point of withdrawing from the political tempests, of which he had so long been the ruler and the victim, to that supreme judicial dignity from which he dispensed a practical wisdom, the benefits of which will continue to be felt till the laws of England become a dead letter. When Lord Waldegrave has occasion to speak of him, it is in such terms as pre-eminent talents might expect from so sagacious an observer.

"Murray, the Attorney General, had greatly the advantage over Pitt in point of argument; and, abuse only excepted, was not much his inferior in any part of oratory. He was the ablest man, as well as the ablest debater in the House of Commons. He was so greatly superior to the rest of his profession, that he stood without a rival, and his merit and abilities must have insured his promotion, had he been known only in Westminster Hall and at the bar of the House of Lords."

The second object of Lord Waldegrave in these Memoirs, was to explain the changes that took place in the British ministry during the period in question. Mr. Pelham died in March 1754. By this event the Duke of Newcastle, who remained Prime Minister, was placed in great difficulties with respect to the management of the House of Commons. Fox and Pitt were both in place, the former as Secretary at War, the latter as Paymaster: but they were allies of very dubious fidelity, and without forming a declared opposition, let few opportunities escape of harassing a ministry, of which they regarded themselves as appendages rather than members. The first determination of the Duke was to secure a firm and effective friend, by placing Fox at the head of the treasury. Upon second thoughts his Grace was apprehensive that such a situation would give Fox too much power, and raise him from the rank of a dependant to that of an equal: the plan was, therefore, changed, and it was fixed, that Fox should be Secretary of State. However, before the terms of the arrangement, which were settled by the Marquis of Hartington, could be carried into execution, the Duke's political fickleness and jealousy had time to operate, and he resolved to recede from his engagements. But on what pretext could he decline to fulfil conditions which had been so deliberately agreed upon, and for which his faith was plighted, not to Fox merely, but also to the connexions of the Cavendish

family? The excuse was indeed 'most characteristical: he admitted the agreement; but *his late family afflictions forsooth had disordered his memory, and he had expressed his meaning in improper words.* The result was the nomination of Sir Thomas Robinson to that office, which by the agreement had been allotted to Mr. Henry Fox.

The situation of the ministry in the House of Commons was now more awkward than before; for Pitt and Fox, though still in place, became more open and alert in the irregular warfare which they carried on against the Duke. Though they could not directly oppose measures which they had themselves in their official capacity approved, they could take such a part in questions where the government did not appear to be immediately concerned, as was extremely embarrassing to the premier, and they made no scruple of attacking the responsible ministers individually with the greatest boldness. Pitt lost no opportunity of assailing Murray; and Fox's department was to expose Sir Thomas Robinson, or rather, as Waldegrave expresses it, to assist him in turning himself into ridicule: for Sir Thomas, though a good Secretary of State, and well versed in the business of his office, was so extremely ridiculous when he played the orator, "that those who loved and esteemed him most could not always preserve a decent composure of countenance." This strange course of proceeding is a clear proof of the disorganization of parties at the time, and indeed of the almost total extinction of party spirit by the prevalence of personal cabals. Our notions of political subordination are at present much more rigid. We should be surprised to see two subalterns in office daily bait their superiors for the amusement of the public.

The Duke well knew the inconveniences of his situation. Though he had in every division a great majority, yet many of his steadiest voters were laughers at least, if not encouragers, on the other side of the question; the house was habituated to see those he trusted with command treated with contempt; his adherents were taught to despise their generals; and he felt that the foundations of his power were thus gradually undermined, and that he might at any moment be deserted by multitudes of his parliamentary forces. He saw the mischief, and was obliged to endure it; for his political jealousy would not allow him to admit Pitt or Fox into a partnership of power, and to have driven them into open opposition, would have made matters still worse.

Affairs continued in this situation till the month of April 1755. The King was on the point of setting out for Hanover, and as there were some apprehensions of an invasion, several of Newcastle's most considerable supporters declared to him, that it was necessary that the Duke of Cumberland should be one of

the council of regency during his Majesty's absence. These representations, seconded by his own timidity, which would not allow him to face danger alone, prevailed with the minister; and at the same time to strengthen his authority in the House of Commons, which during his Majesty's absence would be more precarious than ever, and partly, perhaps, to gratify his Royal Highness, he consented that Fox too should be admitted into the cabinet council, and that employments should be given to many of his friends.

But while the minister thus strengthened himself on one side, he incurred new dangers on the other. The Princess of Wales, with whom he had hitherto been on good terms, and to whom he had shown himself on many occasions a very useful friend, was extremely jealous of the present influence as well as of the future designs of the Duke of Cumberland, and entertained a rooted dislike both of him and of Fox. The introduction of these two individuals into the council of regency, where the Duke, in the absence of his father, would from his rank possess an overbearing influence, was an offence not to be forgiven. She therefore estranged herself from the minister, and, through the intervention of Lord Bute, formed connexions with Pitt. The substance of the treaty between the new allies was "that Pitt and his friends should to their utmost support the Princess and her son; that they should oppose the Duke, and raise a clamour against him; and, as to the King, they were to submit to his government, provided he would govern as they directed him." It ought not to be forgotten, that we have here the model of English patriots entering into factious engagements with *that Princess of Wales* and *that Lord Bute*, whom he and his party within a few short years held up to public odium as the worst enemies of the nation.

The Princess had soon a new motive to plunge deeper into factious intrigue. The King had met at Hanover the eldest daughter of the Duke of Brunswick Wolfenbuttle, and was so charmed with her beauty and accomplishments, that he determined, says Lord Waldegrave, "to make her his granddaughter, being too old to make her his wife. I remember his telling me with great eagerness, that had he been only twenty years younger, she should never have been refused by a Prince of Wales, but should at once have been Queen of England." The King's intentions were soon known in England, and were extremely disagreeable to the Princess. Pains were therefore taken to inspire the Prince with an aversion to the match; the object of the royal choice was so represented, that his prepossession against her rose to invincible dislike; and the suspicion occurred to him that it was the King's wish to sacrifice the happiness of

his grandson to the interests of the Electorate of Hanover. "From this time," says Lord Waldegrave. "all duty and obedience to the grandfather entirely ceased; for though it would have been difficult to have persuaded the Prince to have done that which he thought wrong, he was ready to think right whatever was prompted either by the mother or by her favourite."

The King, upon his return, soon learned the intrigues that had been carried on at Leicester House during his absence, and the result was a mutual coolness between his Majesty on the one hand, and the Princess and her son upon the other, which was never afterwards removed. Lord Waldegrave's remarks on the plan of conduct which the King followed in this conjuncture are as follow. They seem to be coloured with a little spleen.

"About three months after his return to England, his Majesty sent for the Prince of Wales into his closet; not to propose the match, knowing it would be to little purpose, but to find out the extent of his political knowledge, to sift him in relation to Hanover, and to caution him against evil counsellors. The discourse was short, the substance kind and affectionate; but the manner not quite gracious.

"The prince was dustered and sulky; bowed, but scarce made any answer: so the conference ended very little to the satisfaction of either party. Here his Majesty was guilty of a very capital mistake: instead of sending for the Prince, he should have spoke firmly to the mother: told her that as she governed her son, she should be answerable for his conduct: that he would overlook what was past, and treat her still like a friend, if she behaved in a proper manner; but, on the other hand, if either herself, her son, or any person influenced by them, should give any future disturbance, she must expect no quarter; he might then have ended his admonition, by whispering a word in her ear, which would have made her tremble, in spite of her spotless innocence." (P. 50, 51.)

During the King's absence, the near approach of war had become every day more evident; and the Duke of Newcastle, conscious of the ricketty state of his administration, was eager to gain new allies from any quarter, provided it could be done with little danger to his own exclusive supremacy. Negotiations had been opened with Pitt; but Pitt's terms were too high: his *sine quâ non* was to be Secretary of State, and to have power to act in that office according to his own views and maxims. Fox was therefore treated with. His demands were not much lower than Pitt's, but as he was less odious to the King and the Duke of Newcastle than Pitt, an agreement was concluded, and he was named Secretary of State. One symptom of vigour displayed by the ministry in consequence of this accession of strength, was the dismissal of Pitt and his friends from all their employments. Lyttelton alone remained in office; and his refusal to resign was resented by the whole *cousinhood*, (such is the appellation applied

by our author to Pitt's adherents) with the greatest acrimony. But what the Duke gained by the accession of Fox was more than counterbalanced by a loss which he sustained early in 1756. Murray, the Attorney-General, was the only person in the House of Commons, in whose abilities and fidelity he had full confidence. The dignity of Lord Chief Justice of England was now vacant, and this high judicial situation with a peerage was the object to which the labours of Murray's life had been directed. Every effort was made to retain him in the House of Commons; to bribe him into compliance, splendid present employments, with reversions for his family, and a peerage for himself in futurity, were offered to his acceptance and offered in vain. He declared that, if the ministers would not make him Lord Chief Justice, he would no longer continue Attorney-General, and as to the House of Commons, he should leave them to fight their own battles. They were forced to yield, and lost their ablest advocate.

Early in 1756, the Prince and Princess of Wales had been very urgent with the ministry that Lord Bute might be placed at the head of the Prince's establishment. The King and the Duke of Newcastle were both of them exceedingly adverse to the proposal. The partisans of Leicester House, however, persisted in pressing the matter; at the same time, the public discontent was extremely high on account of the loss of Minorca and the failure of the military operations in North America. The Duke, therefore, to diminish the number of his enemies, finally agreed to recommend to his Majesty that Bute should receive the desired promotion. Before this resolution was announced at Leicester House, a curious conversation on the same subject took place between the prince and Lord Waldegrave, the effect of which would be impaired by being given in any words except our author's own.

"One day after dinner, the Prince of Wales began the conversation by desiring I would take nothing amiss; and then proceeded, with much hesitation and confusion, that he certainly should be exceeding glad to employ me hereafter, but that just at present he had very particular reasons against my continuing in his service; that it would be very improper for him to give me a negative; hoped I would not lay him under such a difficulty; and that he should esteem it a real obligation, if my resignation could have the appearance of being entirely my own act.

"I answered, that far from taking any thing amiss, I returned his Royal Highness my humblest thanks for the very gracious manner in which he had expressed himself. That as to my quitting his service, I had often proposed it to the King, who, though much averse to it, had at last given his consent.

“ That this had long been my object; for that several months ago, when his Royal Highness had thought proper to tell me that he expected to have the nomination of the person who was to be at the head of the new establishment, it being necessary there should be a man in such a place, whom he could thoroughly confide in; when he had added, that unless he was gratified in this particular, he should consider all those who were placed about him as his enemies; and when it was very apparent that I was not the person in whom his confidence was reposed, I should undoubtedly have resigned my employment the next morning, if I had not been apprehensive that it might have produced an immediate rupture; for I was determined, if there must be a quarrel between him and his grandfather, which I thought very probable, it should never be placed to my account. That I had persisted in doing all good offices, as long as they were practicable; that when it was no longer in my power to do any real good, I still had endeavoured to do as little harm as possible; and had made use of every opportunity to soften and alleviate whatever had been amiss; but, at the same time, the king having appointed me his Royal Highness's governor, I was accountable to his Majesty, and it was my duty to give information, as to some particulars, when he required it: or supposing it to have been my intention to deceive the king, even in that case, it would have been absurd to have denied those things which might be seen at every drawing-room, and were the subject of conversation at every coffee-house.

“ Those who had persuaded his Royal Highness to speak to me in the manner I have mentioned, had forgot to furnish him with a proper reply: possibly they did not expect that I should have presumed to return so uncourtly an answer: he was much embarrassed, said little, and went immediately to his mother, to give an account of what had passed.

“ In about two days, I was sent for by her Royal Highness, who began by apologising for her son's behaviour: telling me, that I certainly must have misunderstood him on several occasions, or that he had said more than he really intended: that he had a great regard for me, did not like new faces, and was very desirous I should continue in his service: but that he had a very particular esteem for the Earl of Bute, and had set his heart on making him Groom of the Stole; that being Master of the Horse was equally honorable, and if I would accept that employment every thing might be made easy, and the King and her son would both be satisfied.

“ The Prince, who was present, assented to every thing she said, but entered no further into the conversation.

“ I returned their Royal Highnesses my humblest thanks; assured them that whether I quitted, or whether I remained his Royal Highness's servant, I should always be desirous of doing every thing which they should approve of, as far as was consistent with the superior duty I owed to the King: and that nothing could give me more real satisfaction, than to see perfect harmony and union in the royal family.

“ Many compliments passed between us, without the least insincerity on either side; for we did not mean to deceive each other;

but as we were soon to be divided for the rest of our lives, it seemed best to part with the appearance of good humor and civility.

"One of the compliments might, indeed, be somewhat equivocal: I told her Royal Highness that I had frequently taken the liberty of speaking to the King concerning Lord Bute's promotion; but had never obtained a serious answer; for that as often as I touched on the subject, he immediately laughed in my face." * (P. 73—77.)

The King's contempt and dislike of Lord Bute appears to have been extreme. He would not even admit him into the closet to receive in the customary manner the golden key, the badge of his office, but gave it to the Duke of Grafton to slip into Bute's pocket.

The Duke of Newcastle, having gratified Leicester House in the promotion of the Earl of Bute, flattered himself that, if he had not secured new friends, he had at least gotten rid of some enemies. He was disappointed in his calculations. He had refused compliance so long, that his ultimate concession was looked upon as no favour; and, the Prince's establishment not having been completed at the time of Bute's appointment, abundant pretences of complaint were found against the selection of the individuals of whom it was made up. At the same time Fox, treated with coldness by the king, and with suspicion rather than cordiality by the premier, resolved no longer to expose himself, in the responsible situation which he then filled, to the odium of the proceedings, especially of the foreign proceedings, of a minister, who looked upon him in the light not so much of a friend or colleague, as of a secret enemy. He therefore resigned. His resignation was a thunderbolt to Newcastle. "The whole system of the House of Commons was entirely subverted; Fox, no longer a minister; Murray retiring to the House of Peers; Pitt standing without a rival, no orator to oppose him who had the courage even to look him in the face." His Grace, to repair the loss, had recourse to negotiation in every quarter. Offers were made to Pitt, but Pitt would not listen to them: he had infinite respect for his Grace in his private capacity, but he was himself a plain man unpractised in the policy of a court, and must never presume to be the associate of so experienced a minister. The various other negotiations that were set on foot proved equally fruitless: and the Duke unwillingly resigned an office which he coveted, but had not courage to hold.

A new ministry was now formed, of which Mr. Pitt and Earl Temple were the leading members, but which did not promise to be of long duration. The King did not like either the principles or measures of Pitt and Temple. So little was he satisfied with the language put into his mouth at the opening of the session, that hearing of a printer who was to be punished for pub-

lishing a spurious speech from the throne, he expressed his hope that the man's sentence would be mild, because he had read both, and so far as he could understand either of them, he liked the spurious speech better than the real one. If he disapproved of their publick conduct, he was still more dissatisfied with their characters and manneurs as individuals.

"The King, who had a quick conception, and did not like to be kept long in suspense, expected that those who talked to him on business should use no superfluous arguments, but should come at once to the point: whilst Pitt and Lord Temple, who were orators even in familiar conversation, endeavoured to guide his Majesty's passions, and to convince his judgment according to the rules of rhetoric." (P. 90.)

"Pitt, indeed, had not frequent occasions of giving offence, having been confined by the gout the greater part of the winter; and when he had made his appearance he behaved with proper respect, so that the King, though he did not like his long speeches, always treated him like a gentleman.

"But to Lord Temple he had the strongest aversion, his Lordship having a pert familiarity, which is not always agreeable to majesty: besides, in the affair of Admiral Byng, he had used some insolent expressions which the King would never forgive." (P. 93, 94.)

His Majesty, therefore, adopted the resolution of dismissing his ministers, and communicated it in a private conversation to Lord Waldegrave. From what then passed, it is very clear that the King was swayed principally by strong personal dislike.

"He then expressed his dislike to Pitt and Lord Temple in very strong terms, the substance of which was, that the Secretary made him long speeches, which possibly might be very fine, but were greatly beyond his comprehension; and that his letters were affected, formal, and pedantic.

"That as to Temple, he was so disagreeable a fellow, there was no bearing him; that when he attempted to argue, he was pert, and sometimes insolent; that when he meant to be civil, he was exceeding troublesome, and that in the business of his office he was totally ignorant." (P. 95.)

Lord Waldegrave was at the same time charged with the task of commencing a negociation with the Duke of Newcastle, in order to fill the places which were so soon to become vacant. The Duke had not yet recovered from the terror which had a short time before chased him from power, and could not muster up resolution to seize the reins of government that were now offered to his hand. Wavering between ambition and timidity, it was impossible to bring him to any fixed determination.

"He was subject," says Lord Waldegrave, "to such frequent changes, that I found it necessary to declare that he must employ a new

commissioner, unless he would assist my memory, and set down his proposals in writing; being vexed and ashamed that I could hardly say a word in his Grace's name which I was not obliged to contradict the day following. However, if my veracity was suspected, it was soon cleared; for when he explained himself by letter or memorial, there was still the same inconsistency."

While affairs were in this situation, Fox received the royal commands to form a plan of administration. The plan adopted was such as left it in the power of the Duke of Newcastle to become the head of it, and yet, did not make his co-operation indispensable. It failed in consequence of the refusal of the individuals of whom it was to consist to accept their respective offices.

In the mean time the impatience of the King to get rid of his present servants increased every day; and before any scheme of a new administration was settled, Earl Temple received the royal intimation that his services were no longer necessary. It was expected that on this occasion, Pitt would have immediately resigned; but instead of saving his opponents any trouble, he was more assiduous than usual in his attendance at court, so that it was necessary to send him too a formal dismissal. Busy negotiations to fill up the vacant posts now commenced: but few were willing to engage in the management of public affairs at a time of some danger and great discontent, under an aged monarch whose favour was sure to excite the distrust of him, who, according to the usual course of nature, was within a few years to fill the throne. After disappointment in other quarters, recourse was again had to the Duke of Newcastle. His Grace negotiated with Pitt and his adherents. Finding them too high in their demands, he at last formed a ministry from which they were excluded. When all seemed concluded, a letter from Lord Chesterfield, written at the suggestion of Leicester House, brought back his former doubts: he again negotiated with Pitt, and came to a final agreement with him: the King, however, would not give his consent to the terms of it, and the result was that Newcastle, in violation of his express promise, declined any concern in the administration.

The King was now in greater difficulties than ever; and he formally declared his wish, which he had before hinted, that Lord Waldegrave himself should be at the head of the administration which was to be formed. His Lordship refused earnestly and long, but was at last obliged to yield to his master's urgent solicitations. Lords Granville and Winchelsea, the Dukes of Bedford and Devonshire, and Mr. Fox, were to be his principal associates. Many negotiations followed and various plans were arranged, the particulars of which are minutely described in these

Memoirs. Ultimately the whole scheme failed. Fox would not enter firmly and heartily into it; and the ground of his backwardness was partly the King's want of cordiality towards him, and, still more, the little encouragement he received from those on whose assistance he depended in the House of Commons, and the little probability there was of commanding a majority there sufficient for the management of public business. The Duke of Newcastle, too, was very active in preventing the multitude, who from long habit had come to look upon him as their political leader, from engaging in the new ministry. The King was therefore forced, though with infinite reluctance, to abandon his plan, and to surrender its discretion to Newcastle and Pitt. Lord Mansfield first, and afterwards Lord Hardwicke, conducted the negotiations between these hostile, though now co-operating statesmen. Their sentiments were ill adapted for political association. The Duke hated the orator, and the orator despised the Duke; but the one was deficient in political courage, and the other in parliamentary strength, and both coveted power. Accordingly after much dissension a treaty was concluded between them, and that administration was formed which has so often been the theme of extravagant adulation. We take leave of Lord Waldegrave with his account of the presentation of the new ministers at court.

"On the day they were all to kiss hands, I went to Kensington, to entertain myself with the innocent, or, perhaps, ill-natured amusement of examining the different countenances.

"The behaviour of Pitt and his party was decent and sensible; they had neither the insolence of men who had gained a victory, nor were they awkward and disconcerted, like those who come to a place where they know they are not welcome.

"But as to the Duke of Newcastle, and his friends the resigners, there was a mixture of fear and of shame in their countenances: they were all objects of compassion." (P. 138.)

We have seen what were the real causes that led to the establishment of Pitt and his associates in ministerial power. They are not of a very dignified order: the irresolution and timidity of some, the treachery of others, the interestedness of many, and especially their unwillingness to exclude themselves from the benign rays of the rising sun, by serving faithfully an aged monarch. Let us however turn to the page of vulgar history, and we shall find the scene wonderfully changed. There, forsooth, we behold Pitt soaring into office on the wings of genius and virtue, borne up by the breath of disinterested patriotism, and of enthusiastic popular favour.

"The whole nation," says Smollett, "seemed to rise up as one man in the vindication of the fame of Mr. Pitt and Mr. Legge: every mouth

was opened in their praise. The whole kingdom caught fire at the late changes; nor could the power, the cunning, and the artifice of a faction long support it against the united voice of Great Britain which soon pierced the ears of the sovereign. It was not possible to persuade the people, that salutary measures could be suggested or pursued except by the few, whose zeal for the honour of their country and steady adherence to an upright disinterested conduct, had secured their confidence and claimed their veneration. A great number of addresses, dutifully and loyally expressed, solicited the King, ever ready to meet half way the wishes of his faithful people, to restore Mr. Pitt and Mr. Legge to their former employments. Accordingly his Majesty was graciously pleased to redeliver the seals to Mr. Pitt, &c. &c." (*Smollett*, b. iii. c. vii. s. 3.)

Surely it is not necessary to say, which of the two writers is the more worthy of credit; he who recorded what he himself knew, and affairs in which he himself had been an agent, or he who wrote upon the faith of popular rumour and prejudice. Many other examples might be quoted, in which the vague or incorrect ideas, derived from books in general vogue, will be corrected by the perusal of these Memoirs.

We are aware that Lord Waldegrave's work is not fitted to allure the taste of the desultory reader. It presents few anecdotes that can be related with effect in a social circle. It is occupied with plans rather than adventures. It will, however, be perused with satisfaction and advantage by those who study history, not as an accumulation of facts to be remembered, but as the means of leading the mind to reflect on the diversified combinations of human affairs. One very gratifying lesson we learn from it—that, comparing the present time with the past, national concerns are now guided much more according to general views, and are much less subject to the caprice and cabals of individuals than they seem to have been between sixty and seventy years ago.

The letters of Mr. Henry Fox, in the Appendix, are interesting for the information they contain, as well as for the traits of individual character which they exhibit.

ART. XII.—*The Cenci*, a Tragedy in five acts. By Percy Bysshe Shelley. Second Edition, 8vo. pp. 104. C. and J. Ollier, London, 1821. .

THE *Cenci* is the best, because it is by far the most intelligible, of Mr. Shelley's works. It is probably indebted for this advantage to the class of compositions to which it belongs. A tragedy must have a story, and cannot be conducted without men and

women: so that its very nature imposes a check on the vagabond excursions of a writer, who imagines that he can find the perfection of poetry in incoherent dreams or in the ravings of bedlam. In speaking of the *Cenci*, however, as a tragedy, we must add, that we do so only out of courtesy and in imitation of the example of the author, whose right to call his work by what name he pleases we shall never dispute. It has, in fact, nothing really dramatic about it. It is a series of dialogues in verse; and mere versified dialogue will never make a drama. A drama must, in the course of a few scenes, place before us such a succession of natural incidents, as shall lead gradually to the final catastrophe, and develop the characters and passions of the individuals, for whom our interest or our sympathy is to be awakened: these incidents give occasion to the dialogue, which, in its turn, must help forward the progression of events, lay open to us the souls of the agents, move our feelings by the contemplation of their mental agitations, and sooth us with the charms of poetical beauty. It is from the number and nature of the ends which the poet has to accomplish, as compared with the means which he employs, that the glory and difficulty of the dramatic art arise. If the only object of a writer is to tell a story, or to express a succession of various feelings, the form of dialogue, far from adding to the arduousness of the task, is the easiest that can be adopted. It is a sort of drag-net, which enables him to introduce and find a place for every thing that his wildest reveries suggest to him.

The fable of the *Cenci* is taken from an incident which occurred at Rome towards the end of the sixteenth century. An aged father committed the most unnatural and horrible of outrages on his daughter; his wife and daughter avenged the crime by procuring the assassination of the perpetrator, and became in their turns the victims of public justice. The incident is still recollected, and often related at Rome. Hence Mr. Shelley infers, "that it is, in fact, a tragedy which has already received, from its capacity of awakening and sustaining the sympathy of man, approbation and success." It is remembered and related, because it is extraordinary—because it is horrible,—because it is, in truth, *undramatic*. A murder, attended with circumstances of peculiar atrocity, is scarcely ever forgotten on the spot where it happened; but it is not for that reason a fit subject for dramatic poetry. The catastrophe of Marrs' family will be long recollected in London; the assassination of Fualdes will not soon be forgotten in Rhodes; yet who would ever dream of bringing either event upon the stage? Incestuous rape, murder, the rack, and the scaffold, are not the proper materials of the tragic Muse: crimes and punishments are not in themselves dramatic, though the conflict of passions which they occasion, and from which they arise, often is so.

The pollution of a daughter by a father—the murder of a father by his wife and daughter, are events too disgusting to be moulded into any form capable even of awakening our interest. Mr. Shelley himself seems to have been aware of this. “The story of the Cenci,” says he, “is indeed eminently fearful and monstrous; any thing like a dry exhibition of it on the stage would be insupportable. The person who would treat such a subject must increase the ideal, and diminish the actual, horror of the events, so that the pleasure which arises from the poetry, which exists in these tempestuous sufferings and crimes, may mitigate the pain of the contemplation of the moral deformity from which they spring.” Without presuming to comprehend these observations completely (for we know not what poetry exists in rape and murder, or what pleasure is to be derived from it), we are sure, that whatever may be thought as to the possibility of overcoming by any management the inherent defects of the tale, Mr. Shelley, far from having even palliated its moral and its dramatic improprieties, has rendered the story infinitely more horrible and more disgusting than he found it, and has kept whatever in it is most revolting constantly before our eyes. A dialogue in which Cenci makes an open confession to a Cardinal of a supreme love of every thing bad merely for its own sake, and of living only to commit murder—a banquet given by him to the Roman nobility and dignitaries, to celebrate an event of which he has just received the news,—the death of two of his sons—and declarations of gratuitous uncaused hatred against all his relations, not excepting that daughter whom he resolves to make the victim of his brutal outrage for no other reason than because his imagination is unable to devise any more horrible crime, fill up the first two acts. Cenci has accomplished the deed of horror before the opening of the third act, in which the resolution to murder him is taken. In the fourth he again comes before us, expressing no passion, no desire, but pure abstract depravity and impiety. The murder follows, with the immediate apprehension of the members of the family by the officers of justice. The last act is occupied with the judicial proceedings at Rome. Cenci is never out of our sight, and, from first to last, he is a mere personification of wickedness and insanity. His bosom is ruffled by no passion; he is made up exclusively of inveterate hatred, directed not against some individuals, but against all mankind, and operating with a strength proportioned to the love which each relation usually excites in other men. There is no mode of expressing depravity in words which Mr. Shelley has not ransacked his imagination to ascribe to this wretch. His depravity is not even that of human nature; for it is depravity without passion, without aim, without temptation: it is depravity seeking gratification, first, in the perpetration of all

that is most repulsive to human feelings, and next in making a display of its atrocity to the whole world. The following dialogue, for example, (and it is one of the gentler passages of the play) takes place in the presence of, and is in part addressed to, the Roman nobles and cardinals assembled at a banquet:—

CEN. It is indeed a most desired event.
If, when a parent, from a parent's heart,
Lifts from this earth to the great father of all
A prayer, both when he lays him down to sleep
And when he rises up from dreaming it;
One supplication, one desire, one hope,
That he would grant a wish for his two sons,
Even all that he demands in their regard—
And suddenly, beyond his dearest hope,
It is accomplished, he should then rejoice,
And call his friends and kinsmen to a feast,
And task their love to grace his merriment,
Then honour me thus far—for I am he.

BEATR. (*to Lucretia*) Great God! How horrible! Some
dreadful ill
Must have befallen my brothers.

LUCR. Fear not, child,
He speaks too frankly.

BEATR. Ah! My blood runs cold.
I fear that wicked laughter round his eye,
Which wrinkles up the skin even to the hair.

CEN. Here are the letters brought from Salamanca;
Beatrice, read them to your mother. God,
I thank thee! In one night didst thou perform,
By ways inscrutable, the thing I sought.
My disobedient and rebellious sons
Are dead!—Why dead!—What means this change of cheer?
You hear me not, I tell you they are dead;
And they will need no food or raiment more:
The tapers that did light them the dark way
Are their last cost. The Pope, I think, will not
Expect I should maintain them in their coffins.
Rejoice with me, my heart is wondrous glad.

BEATR. (*Lucretia sinks, half fainting; Beatrice supports her.*)
It is not true!—Dear lady, pray look up.
Had it been true, there is a God in Heaven,
He would not live to boast of such a boon.
Unnatural man, thou know'st that it is false!

CEN. Ay, as the word of God; whom here I call
To witness that I speak the sober truth;
And whose most favouring Providence was shewn
Even in the manner of their deaths. For Rocco
Was kneeling at the mass, with sixteen others,
When the church fell and crushed him to a mummy;

The rest escaped unhurt. * Cristofano
 Was stabbed in error by a jealous man,
 Whilst she he loved was sleeping with his rival;
 All in the self-same hour of the same night;
 Which shews that Heaven has special care of me.
 I beg those friends who love me, that they mark
 The day a feast upon their calendars. *
 It was the twenty-seventh of December:
 Ay, read the letters if you doubt my oath.
 (*The assembly appears confused; several of the guests rise.*)

1. GUEST. Oh, horrible! I will depart.

2. GUEST. And I.

3. GUEST. No, stay!

I do believe it is some jest; though faith
 'Tis mocking us somewhat too solemnly.
 I think his son has married the Infanta,
 Or found a mine of gold in El dorado;
 'Tis but to season some such news; stay, stay!
 I see 'tis only raillery by his smile.
 CEN. (*filling a bowl of wine, and lifting it up*)
 Oh, thou bright wine, whose purple splendour leaps
 And bubbles gaily in this golden bowl
 Under the lamp-light, as my spirits do,
 To hear the death of my accursed sons!
 Could I believe thou wert their mingled blood,
 Then would I taste thee like a sacrament,
 And pledge with thee the mighty Devil in Hell;
 Who, if a father's curses, as men say,
 Climb with swift wings after their children's souls,
 And drag them from the very throne of Heaven,
 Now triumphs in my triumph!—But thou art
 Superfluous; I have drunken deep of joy,
 And I will taste no other wine to-night.
 Here, Andrea! Bear the bowl around." (P. 13—16.)

The first time he alludes to the deed, which constitutes the substance of the plot, is in the following words addressed to a cardinal:—

"—— I am what your theologians call
 Hardened; which they must be in impudence,
 So to revile a man's peculiar taste.

* * * * *

*But that there yet remains a deed to act
 Whose horror might make sharp an appetite
 Duller than mine—I'd do—I know not what."*—(P. 6, 7.)

After the unnatural outrage has been committed, he aims something still more extravagant in iniquity:—

"Might I not drag her by the golden hair?
 Stamp on her? Keep her sleepless, till her brain

- Be overworn? Tame her with chains and famine?
 Less would suffice. *Yet so to leave undone
 What I most seek! No, 'tis her stubborn will,
 Which, by its own consent, shall stoop as low
 As that which drags it down.*—(P. 56.)

His wife tries to terrify him by pretending that his death has been announced by a supernatural voice; his reply is in these words:

“—— Why—such things are—
 No doubt divine revealings may be made.
 'Tis plain I have been favoured from above,
 For when I cursed my sons, they died. Aye—so
As to the right or wrong, that's talk—repentance,
 Repentance is an easy moment's work,
 And more depends on God than me. Well—well,
 I must give up the greater point, which was
 To poison and corrupt her soul.”—(P. 57, 58.)

Such blasphemous ravings cannot be poetry, for they are neither sense nor nature. No such being as *Cenci* ever existed; none such could exist. The historical fact was in itself disgustingly shocking; and, in Mr. Shelley's hands, the fable becomes even more loathsome and less dramatic than the fact. It is true that there are tragedies of the highest order (the *Œdipus Tyrannus* for instance) where the catastrophe turns upon an event from which nature recoils; but the deed is done unwittingly; it is a misfortune, not a crime; it is kept back as much as possible from our view; the hopes, and fears, and sufferings of the parties occupy our thoughts, and all that is revolting to purity of mind is only slightly hinted at. Here the deed is done with premeditation; it is done from a wanton love of producing misery; it is constantly obtruded upon us in its most disgusting aspect; the most hateful forms of vice and suffering, preceded by involuntary pollution and followed by voluntary parricide, are the materials of this miscalled tragedy. They who can find dramatic poetry in such representations of human life must excuse us for wondering of what materials their minds are composed. Delineations like these are worse than unpoetical; they are unholy and immoral. But “they are as lights,” if we believe Mr. Shelley, “to make apparent some of the most dark and secret caverns of the human heart.” No, no; they teach nothing; and, if they did, knowledge must not be bought at too high a price. There is a knowledge which is death and pollution. Is knowledge any compensation for the injury sustained by being made familiar with that which ought to be to us all as if it were not? If such feelings, such ideas, exist in the world, (we cannot believe they do, for the *Cenci* of the Roman tradition is very different from the *Cenci* of Mr. Shelley) let them

remain concealed. Our corporeal frames moulder into dust after death: are putrefying bodies, therefore, to be exposed in the public ways, that, forsooth, we may know what we are to be hereafter? The ties of father and daughter, of husband and wife, ought not to be profaned as they are in this poem. It is in vain to plead, that the delineations are meant to excite our hatred; they ought not to be presented to the mind at all; still less, pressed upon it long and perseveringly.

The technical structure of the piece is as faulty as its subject matter is blamable. The first two acts serve only to explain the relative situation of the parties, and do not in the least promote the action of the play; the fifth, containing the judicial proceedings at Rome, is a mere excrescence. The whole plot, therefore, is comprised in the incestuous outrage and in the subsequent assassination of the perpetrator; the former enormity occurs in the interval between the second act and the third; the latter in the fourth act. Thus the play has, properly speaking, no plot except in the third and fourth acts. But the incurable radical defects of the original conception of this drama render a minute examination of its structure superfluous.

The language is loose and disjointed; sometimes it is ambitious of simplicity, and it then becomes bald, inelegant, and prosaic. Words sometimes occur to which our ears are not accustomed; thus an "unappealable God" means a God from whom there is no appeal. We have a great deal of confused and not very intelligible imagery. A crag is "huge as despair;" Cenci

Bears a gloom duller
Than the earth's shade or interlunar air:"

And he describes his soul as a scourge, which will not be demanded of him till "*the lash be broken in its last and deepest wound:*"

"My soul, which is a scourge, will I resign
Into the hands of him who wielded it;
Be it for its own punishment or theirs,
He will not ask it of me till the lash
Be broken in its last and deepest wound;
Until its hate be all inflicted."—(P. 58.)

We extract the following lines, because we have heard them much admired:—

If there should be
No God, no Heaven, no Earth in the void world;
The wide, grey, lampless, deep, unpeopled world!
If all things then should be—my father's spirit,
His eye, his voice, his touch, surrounding me;

• The atmosphere and breath of my dead life !
 If sometimes, as a shape more like himself,
 Even the form which tortured me on earth,
 Masked in grey hairs and wrinkles, he should come
 And wind me in his hellish arms, and fix
 His eyes on mine, and drag me down, down, down !
 For was he not alone omnipotent
 On Earth, and ever present ? Even tho' dead,
 Does not his spirit live in all that breathe,
 And work for me and mine still the same ruin,
 Scorn, pain, despair ?" (P. 99, 100.)

We confess that to us this seems metaphysical jargon in substance, dressed out in much flaunting half-worn finery.

The following is another of the admired passages in this tissue of versified dialogue :—

“ BEATR. How comes this hair undone ?
 Its wandering ~~strings~~ must be what blind me so,
 And yet I tied it fast.—O, horrible !
 The pavement sinks under my feet ! The walks
 Spin round ! I see a woman weeping there,
 And standing calm and motionless, whilst I
 Slide giddily as the world reels—My God !
 The beautiful blue heaven is flecked with blood !
 The sunshine on the floor is black ! The air
 Is changed to vapours such as the dead breathe
 In charnel pits ! Pah ! I am choked ! There creeps
 A clinging, black, contaminating mist
 About me—'tis substantial, heavy, thick,
 I cannot pluck it from me, for it glues
 My fingers and my limbs to one another,
 • And eats into my sinews, and dissolves
 My flesh to a pollution, poisoning
 • The subtle, ~~pure, and~~ almost spirit of life !
 My God ! I never knew what the mad felt
 Before ; for I am mad beyond all ~~doubt~~ *more wildly* !
 No, I am dead ! These putrefying limbs
 Shut round and sepulchre the panting soul,
 Which would burst forth into the wandering air ! *(a pause)*
 What hideous thought was that I had even now ?
 'Tis gone ; and yet its burthen remains here
 O'er these dull eyes—upon this weary heart !
 O, world ! O, life ! O, day ! O, misery !

LUCR. What ails thee, my poor child ? She answers not :
 Her spirit apprehends the sense of pain,
 But not its cause ; suffering has dried away
 The source from which it sprung.

BEATR. *(frantically)* Like parricide—
 Misery has killed its father : yet its father
 Never like mine.”—(P. 35, 36.)

We say nothing of the conceit of misery killing its own father, because we wish to direct our observations, not to the imperfections of particular passages, but to the general want of fidelity to nature which pervades the whole performance. In the crowd of images here put into the mouth of Beatrice, there is neither novelty, nor truth, nor poetical beauty. Misery like hers is too intensely occupied with its own pangs to dwell so much on extraneous ideas. It does not cause the pavement to sink, or the wall to spin round, or the sunshine to become black; it does not stain the heaven with blood; it does not change the qualities of the air, nor does it clothe itself in a mist which glues the limbs together, cuts into the sinews, and dissolves the flesh; still less does it suppose itself dead. This is not the language either of extreme misery or of incipient madness; it is the bombast of a declamation, straining to be energetic, and falling into extravagant and unnatural rant.

CEN. Andrea! Go call my daughter,
 And if she comes not, tell her that I come.
 What sufferings? I will drag her, step by step,
 Through infamies unheard of among men:
 She shall stand shelterless in the broad noon
 Of public scorn, for acts blazoned abroad,
 One among which shall be—What? Canst thou guess?
 She shall become (for what she most abhors
 Shall have a fascination to entrap
 Her loathing will) to her own conscious self
 All she appears to others; and when dead,
 As she shall die unshrived and unforgiven,
 A rebel to her father and her God,
 Her corpse shall be abandoned to the hounds;
 Her name shall be the terror of the earth;
 Her spirit shall approach the throne of God
 Plague-spotted with my curses. *I will make*
 Body and soul a monstrous lump of ruin.

Enter ANDREA.

ANDR. The lady Beatrice—

CEN. Speak, pale slave! What
 Said she?

ANDR. My Lord, 'twas what she looked she said:
 "Go tell my father that I see the gulph
 "Of Hell between us two, which he may pass,
 "I will not." *(Exit ANDREA.)*

CEN. Go thou quick, Lucretia,
 Tell her to come; yet let her understand
 Her coming is consent; and say, moreover,
 That if she come not I will curse her. *(Exit LUCRETIA.)*
 Ha!

With what but with a father's curse doth God

Panic-strike armed victory, and make pale
 Cities in their prosperity? The world's Father
 Must grant a parent's prayer against his child,
 Be he who asks even what men call me.
 Will not the deaths of her rebellious brothers
 Awe her before I speak? For I on them
 Did imprecate quick ruin, and it came." (P. 59, 60.)

This passage exemplifies the furious exaggeration of Mr. Shelley's caricatures, as well as of the strange mode in which, throughout the whole play, religious thoughts and atrocious deeds are brought together. There is something extremely shocking in finding the truths, the threats, and the precepts of religion in the mouth of a wretch, at the very moment that he is planning or perpetrating crimes at which nature shudders. In this intermixture of things, sacred and impure, Mr. Shelley is not inconsistent if he believes that religion is in Protestant countries hypocrisy, and that it is in Roman Catholic countries "adoration, faith, submission, penitence, blind admiration; not a rule for moral conduct, and that it has no necessary connexion with any one virtue."—(Preface, p. 13.) Mr. Shelley is in an error: men act wrongly in spite of religion; but it is because they have no steady belief of it, or because their notions of it are erroneous, or because its precepts do not occur to them at the moment some vicious passion prevails. A Christian murderer does not amuse his fancy with the precepts and denunciations of his faith at the very moment of perpetrating the deed.

The moral errors of this book prevent us from quarrelling with its literary sins.

ART. XIII.—SCRIPTURE CHRONOLOGY.

1. *The Chronology of our Saviour's Life; or, an Inquiry into the true time, of the Birth, Baptism, and Crucifixion of Jesus Christ.* By the Rev. C. Benson, M. A. 8vo. Baldwin and Co. London, 1819.

2. *Watson Refuted: being an Answer to the Apology for the Bible, in a Series of Letters to the Bishop of Llandaff.* By Samuel Francis, M. D. 8vo. Reprinted by Carlile. London, 1819.

3. *New Researches of Ancient History.* By C. F. Volney. Translated in Paris, under the superintendence of the Author, by Colonel Corbet. 2 vols. 8vo. Lewis. London, 1819.

4. *The Books of Genesis and Daniel defended against Count Volney, Dr. Francis, &c.* By John Overton. 8vo. Simpkin and Marshall. London, 1820.

It is only in reference to Scripture chronology that these books have any thing in common; except that two of them, written by avowed infidels, alike abound in scurrility, in profaneness, and in gratuitous assertions, the positiveness of which is usually proportioned to their falsehood. The other two publications, though alike designed to elucidate and confirm the sacred Scriptures, have little in common but that becoming moderation by which they are both contrasted with the vehemence and virulence which characterize the effusions of infidelity. It is in this respect only, that we can commend Mr. Overton's performance: in every other, he continually reminds us of a citation sufficiently hackneyed—*non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis, opus eget*; for we confess that we had rather see Christianity assailed by twenty such foes as Count Volney and Dr. Francis, than defended by one such advocate as Mr. Overton. He professes to believe the Apocrypha, the book of Enoch, the testament of the twelve Patriarchs, the gospel of Nicodemus, &c. &c. as firmly as the Bible: and, indeed, if the latter warranted such extravagant hypotheses as he ascribes to it, it would be nearly as incredible as the writings to which he attributes equal authority. To pass from such books to Mr. Benson's performance, has afforded us a sensible gratification; and although this has doubtless been heightened by the contrast, we are confident that his "Chronology of our Saviour's life" will amply recommend itself to every reader who is qualified to judge of the discussion. As it belongs, however, to the latest department of Scripture chronology, we must postpone farther attention to it, till we have, in a rapid view of the whole subject, referred, as we find occasion, to leading parts of the other publications, under the periods to which they relate.

The book of Genesis seems to be peculiarly offensive to disbelievers of divine revelation, who usually bring against it the most absurd and inconsistent charges. They object to it, as an invention of the Jews in order to carry their own antiquity as high as the creation. When reminded, however, that the Israelites were no more connected with Adam, or even with Noah, than the other nations of the globe; and that the Israelites always represented their own nation to be of inferior antiquity, not only to the Egyptians, Canaanites, and Philistines; but even to others who derived their origin, in common with themselves, from Abraham, Lot, and Isaac; the cavillers fall about, and assert Genesis to have been an Armenian or Chaldean

document, to which the Jews had' no claim; and that it was at a late period added to the catalogue of writings falsely ascribed to Moses. The plain truth, so far as evidence of the existence of Hebrew writings can be traced, is, that it was always comprised in what the Jews called the *Law*, as distinguished from the *Prophets* (including the other historical, as well as the prophetical books), and from the *Scriptures*, containing the writings of David and Solomon. Whether the distribution of the law into five parts, or books, was first made by the Greek translators, or at an earlier date, it is certain that Genesis has always been reckoned one of those books. It was, therefore, sanctioned by Moses: but we admit that its subjects, and its mode of construction, imply him rather to have been the *compiler* than the *author*, of Genesis. It exhibits plain signs of comprising numerous distinct memorials; to many of which the original titles, "These are the generations," &c. remain prefixed: and the style usually changes with the title, especially in the appellation of God; who in the first of these sections is called *Elohim*, in the next *Jehovah Elohim*, in the third, only *Jehovah*, and in others, alternately, *Elohim* or *Jehovah*.

All the sections of Genesis, excepting the first, and those which contain genealogies, have every internal mark of having been committed to writing by eye-witnesses of the facts that are recorded. Even the fall of man is described precisely as an eye-witness might report the facts, relating only what was seen or heard, without inference or remark. Neither do we perceive any sound reason to deny that it could be recorded by the first father of mankind; who, in a life of more than nine centuries, might surely devise means of expressing, either by hieroglyphical or arbitrary characters, ideas so simple as those which are communicated to us of his history. Whether alphabetical letters were invented before, or after the deluge, appears to us to be wholly uncertain.

The history of Creation, closing with verse 3, of the second chapter of Genesis, must evidently have been either revealed or fabricated. Against this portion of Scripture, therefore, the enemies of divine revelation especially direct their attacks; and it is to be lamented, that to these the oversights of its friends have afforded openings. Due attention to the precision of the original expressions would have guarded them. The term rendered "created" signifies to bring into first existence; that which is translated "made," signifies to form, organize, arrange, or finish, what had previously been created. So "the heavens," or celestial spheres, "and the earth," were, at the same time, produced from nothing, chap. i. verse 1. Mr. Overton strangely imagines them to have been formed of something

eternal, which he calls pure éther; because (he says) of nothing, nothing is made: as if God was nothing, or incapable of bringing anything into existence! Whatever was the first form of universal matter, it was created by God. Sir Isaac Newton supposed it, in the first instance, to have been formed into the various spheres of fixed stars and planets; but the subsequent process seems rather to imply that atoms, dispersed over the extent of the universe, were attracted one to another at various centres of gravitation; and cohered in bodies nearly spherical, of very unequal dimensions; the smaller of which then gravitated toward the nearest of superior magnitude.

Disbelievers of the Bible do not fail to take notice of the *plural* name assigned to the Creator, and of his use of plural verbs and pronouns. Volney, who devoted much of his first volume to cavils against the book of Genesis, inferred, from this supposed inconsistency with the doctrine of the Divine Unity, that the compiler of the Pentateuch could not be Moses. Trinitarian Christians can otherwise account for this phenomenon: but it behoves *Christian Unitarians*, (so called by themselves, in distinction from Jews, Mahometans, and Deists) to reflect whether the charge of producing obstacles to a belief of the Scriptures, which they have often brought against Trinitarians, does not more justly devolve on themselves. We must leave them to answer Volney, vol. i. p. 179, in the best manner they can. We relinquish to them also, in common with infidels, the translation of Elohîm, when preceding a singular verb, by the English plural, *Gods*. The use of the title God, in English, agrees with that of Jehovah, not that of Elohîm, in Hebrew. The latter is evidently a plural noun, but not the plural of *God*. The Greek translators used *Θεοι*, because the language had no proper term for an eternal cause of all things. This is what *we* mean by God, and it therefore *can* have ~~no plural~~. The second verse of the Bible apprizes us, that the *Spirit* of Elohim (in distinction from Elohîm) operated in the process of creation. Those critics who chose to translate the original term "wind," instead of spirit, should explain to us how *wind* could precede the formation of the atmosphere.

As it was not till the *fourth* revolution of the earth round its axis, that the *heavenly* bodies were finally arranged, so as to regulate seasons, days, and years, (to which the centrifugal movement, and obliquity in the ecliptics of the planets, were indispensable), they might, till then, have been gradually attracted toward the sun, and might have revolved round their axes less rapidly than afterwards. If the surface of the earth, instead of whirling, as now, with a velocity of more than 1000 miles in an hour, turned round (like our moon) but once in the

course of a month, the formation of its atmosphere, the gradual separation of land and water, and the commencement and progress of vegetation, promoted by the continued influence of light and heat, would be more easily comprehensible, than if all this process was accomplished in ninety-six hours. The extent, however, of the time that was occupied by the first four revolutions of the earth, is merely conjectural. The last two days of the creative process must, according to Scripture, have been each of twenty-four hours only. Mr. Overton assigns to each of the six days, alike, a duration of 1000 years; and Mr. Volney supposes them to be allegorical of the six months of summer, during which the earth is restored from its preceding devastation by winter. He has employed the 17th chapter of his first part, on a comparison of this history with the traditions and astronomical computations of ancient nations: but they bear no other resemblance to it, than that of absurd fabrications to simple truth, which they have variously distorted.

The simplicity of nature characterizes the antediluvian chronology of the Bible. The only symptom of contrivance consists in the precautions used to guard against the corruption of these remote dates, the necessity for which has since become sufficiently apparent. A revised edition of the Pentateuch, which was used by the Babylonian colonists of Samaria, and the Greek version that was made by Jews in Egypt about a century later, both differ widely and systematically from the Hebrew chronology of this period, but still more from each other. Assuming the three copies to be of equal authority, and preferring those dates in which *any two* of them agree, *all* the HEBREW dates are confirmed, except those of the patriarch Lamech's life. In these last-mentioned dates, and in these alone, *all* the three copies differ from each other. The dissonance seems to have arisen from inadvertent errors of copyists, and we think the Greek date of Lamech's age at the birth of Noah, 188, preferable, on the whole, to 182, which is that of the Hebrew Bible. An incidental (and seemingly uncorrupted) date of Josephus, concurs to establish this correction of the period preceding the flood, which he computes (*Antiq.* l. 8, c. 3) at 1662 years.

The Hebrews reckoned by current, not complete, days and years, calling a week (like the French) eight days, and the same year the last of one king's reign and the first of his successor's. But the ages of the antediluvian patriarchs at the births of their next heirs, are otherwise computed, evidently for the purpose of adding these to the years which they survived, and annexing the total age of every patriarch. The date of Noah's age, 500 years, related doubtless to the birth of Shem; because it was in *his* line only, not in that of Ham, or that of Japheth, that the

chronology was to be carried on. The deluge commenced in the 600th year of Noah's life, and continued an entire year. "Shem was 100 years old, and begat Arphaxad two years after the flood;" that is (according to the Hebrew idiom) in the second year from the commencement of the flood, or within the next year after its termination. This consequently was the 601st year of Noah's life, who, therefore, had completed his 600th year before the birth of Shem, and Shem his 100th year before that of Arphaxad. The genealogy thus appears to be extended by the same mode of computation beyond the flood, and should be dated accordingly till the birth of Abraham, when Terah was full 70 years of age. The date of Haran's or Nahor's birth would have been worse than none; as it could have been of no use, and must have given occasion to perplexity: yet Archbishop Usher so interpreted that date; and imagined that Abraham was not born till his father was 130 years old; although the apostle Paul represents it as supernatural, that Abraham had a son at the age of 100 years. This innovation nevertheless has commonly been adopted by subsequent chronologers, solely because the martyr Stephen remarked that the call of Abraham succeeded the death of his father. The most natural inference was, that there must be an error, either in the date of Abraham's birth, or in that of his father's death, (which is 205;) as it is certain that Abraham migrated to Canaan in his own 75th year. The Samaritan copy decides this doubt, having preserved the true date of Terah's age, 145 years, at the time of his death. Its testimony is in this instance the more valid, because the correction tends to diminish the interval between the deluge and the call of Abraham, in opposition to the *systematic* discrepancies of the Samaritan post-diluvian chronology from the Hebrew. Both the Samaritan and the Septuagint make that interval incomparably greater than the Hebrew, in conformity with the prejudices of those nations with which the respective fabricators were chiefly connected: but after the flood they *implicitly* confirm the Hebrew, as they had more palpably done in the dates preceding it.

To the antiquary, and to the glossologist, the origin of nations recorded in the tenth chapter of Genesis, is invaluable, in reference to those countries with which the Hebrews retained intercourse. Volney prefers to call it a Chaldean document; but if such, it would probably have related to countries eastward, no less than to those that are westward, of the Tigris. M. Volney had travelled in several of the latter countries, and well knew that many places, districts, and tribes, still bear the same names that had been applied to them by the Hebrews, who represented such names as those of the first progenitors of the nations respec-

tively; but, instead of frankly acknowledging this evidence of the authenticity of the Bible, he chose gratuitously to assume, that the original genealogies were fabricated from names which the countries had inexplicably obtained. Similar instances were certainly not uncommon in the darker ages of the Christian era, among semi-barbarous nations; but, like counterfeit coin, they rather imply than exclude an authentic pattern. They furnish, therefore, no argument against the authenticity of this very ancient document, for which we are indebted to the compilers of the Hebrew Scriptures. It is supported by every historical evidence that can bear upon a subject of such remote antiquity.

The family of Ham partly remained near the centre of dispersion, but far the greater part rapidly spread themselves abroad. His eldest son Cush occupied Chuzistan; and Havilah, son of Cush, the adjacent district between the rivers Eulæus, (the Gyndes or Gihon) and Pison, or the Choaspes. Ham's other sons passed to the south-eastern shore of the Mediterranean, where Canaan remained. Phut entered Africa at the isthmus, and gradually spreading over the northern districts, became progenitor of the Libyans, the Numidians, the Maurusians, and the Gætulians, excepting those called Melano-Gætuli, who descended from Cush. The family of the latter occupied the Arabian coasts, and crossing the Red Sea into Africa, spread over its interior to its southern and western coasts. Part of them also, spreading eastward from the Euphrates, beyond the Persian Gulph, contributed to the mingled population of Hindoostan, where they were called Eastern Ethiopians. Ham, with his second son Mizraim, remained in Egypt, and founded the cities of Thebes, Theis, and Memphis, which shortly became independent states; as did afterwards Assuan (or Elephantina) at the southern, and Zoan (or Tanis) at the northern extremity of Egypt. The dynasties that first ruled these several petty monarchies have been preserved, and, by piling them one above another, the Egyptians exalted their claims to antiquity. Sir John Marsham (whom Volney incorrectly asserts to have left ancient chronology as he found it) in his *Chronicus Canon* (folio 1672), adopted the only proper mode of adjusting the Egyptian chronology, by disposing the earliest dynasties collaterally. He erred in the application of his rule, a right use of which is still adequate to the development of this interesting object. Thebes appears to have been founded about 217 years after the Deluge; a period which the Egyptians assigned to the reigns of eight demi-gods and goddesses; perhaps in reference to the persons that were preserved in the ark. From that date, to the invasion of Egypt by Sennacherib, the interval corresponded with the Sothiacal cycle of 1460 years; which alone the paradox whereby the priests of Thebes baffled the inquiries of Herodotus can

reasonably be understood to intimate. The intervening synchronisms of the Israelite and Egyptian histories admit also, on this principle, of a very satisfactory adjustment.

The chronology of the Hebrew Scriptures alone can suffice for the guidance of such researches. Volney, by rejecting its aid when most needful, was reduced to mere conjecture, in which he indulged, to the wildest extravagance. Relinquishing all pretence to a chain of ancient chronology, he rested his belief of the duration of the world on constructions of the Zodiac that have been discovered in the remains of Egyptian temples; as if a sphere might not as easily have been adapted to the computation of astronomical cycles, as to the time when it was made. A much better and greater man had led the way to such mistakes. Sir Isaac Newton, by assuming the date of the Argonautic voyage from a supposed construction of the sphere, deranged nearly every date of profane history, and involved that of Egypt especially in inextricable confusion. Other men, also of genuine science, (to which, however, Volney had no pretension) have too often trusted to dubious astronomical phenomena, in preference to authentic dates, on which alone chronology necessarily depends.

With the corrections that have before been established, the Deluge coincided with the year from the Creation 1662, and the call of Abraham in his 75th year, being the 367th inclusive from the Deluge, with A. M. 2028. Nearly two centuries had probably then elapsed from the commencement of the dispersion of mankind; and Nimrod, after establishing his sovereignty over the Chasdites (or Arphaxadites) at Babel, seems gradually to have extended it throughout their possessions in Mesopotamia; as also to the Asshurites, or Assyrians, northward; to the Aramites, or Syrians, westward; and even to the more distant Canaanites. Improbable as it may naturally be thought, that so wide an empire should be established in that early age, we find that the numerous petty monarchs of Canaan, when Abraham came to dwell among them, were tributary to Chedorlaomer, King of Elam; who reigned eastward of the Tigris, and to whom the Kings of Shinar (or Babel) and the adjacent countries were likewise subordinate. Babylon, according to Berosus, had from the first an elective government; and the ten kings whom he preposterously reports to have reigned there *before* the deluge, might intervene between Nimrod and Amraphel, who was a vassal of Chedorlaomer. To the last named sovereign the empire founded by Nimrod appears at that time to have devolved. Another proof of its early aggrandisement is, that all who occupied these countries, whether descendants of Ham, or of Shem, and whether of the posterity of Aram, Ashur, or Arphaxad, immemorially used dialects of a language which the family of the latter patriarch

seem to have formed. The Chaldee, the Syriac, the Hebrew, and the Punic languages, were all radically the same, and must apparently have been forcibly imposed on nations that had no natural connexion with each other. Such a practice has been usual with conquerors, and a very remote instance of it is recorded by Moses of Chorene. The earlier it commenced, the more easily it might be carried into effect; as Nimrod might pursue and subjugate the emigrant tribes, while their several languages were as yet very imperfectly formed. It is unlikely that he assumed authority over the elder branches of his own family, which remained near the centre of dispersion; and though both Cush and Havilah might assist in laying the foundation of his power, yet the body of his subjects being Arphaxadites, he would impose their language on all the rest whom he reduced to subjection.

It is only when *predictive*, that we consider chronology as matter of divine revelation; and in this light it both confirms and illustrates dates that were recorded by writers contemporary with the events. When the inspired writers of the New Testament refer to dates of the Old, it is as being adequate judges of its chronology that we cite their testimony; not as imputing to inspiration what they were competent otherwise to ascertain. In all these modes, the interval, from Abraham's call to the Exodus, is determined. The series of particular dates extends no farther than the death of Joseph: but the total, 430 years, given Exodus xii, 40, 41, is explained by the apostle Paul (Gal. iii, 17) to comprise the whole period. Predictive chronology was usually adapted to be accurately understood only by its fulfilment; for nothing would commonly be more fatal to mankind than certainty about future events. The prediction given to Abraham (Gen. xv. 13—16) might have been interpreted as variously as the dates of the Apocalypse; but it was sufficiently explained by its completion.

The Israelites, therefore, left Egypt in the 430th year from the call of Abraham, or A. M. 2457. The dynasties of Africanus, adjusted by Eratosthenes's authentic catalogue of Theban kings, and illustrated by Josephus's extracts from Manetho's history, indicate *that* year to have coincided with the death of Apachnas, the third of the shepherd kings, under whose tyranny the Egyptians endured almost as severe oppression as the Israelites are recorded to have undergone. The commencement of the pastoral dynasty, about a century earlier, is indicated by the accession of a new sovereign of Egypt, who paid no regard to the memory, or the kindred, of Joseph. (Exod. i. 8.) Every circumstance renders it likely that the main body of these cruel invaders were Amalekites: and incidental observations by Moses suggest pro-

able occasions of their irruption into Egypt at that crisis. The Canaanites eastward of Jordan had been recently expelled from their possessions by the descendants of Lot; and those of Mount Seir, by the Edomites. It has always been usual for nomadic nations to break unawares into a neighbouring country, rather than defend their own against a powerful people prepared and determined to invade them: and the ferocious and predatory Amalekites, who nomadized on the border of Egypt, would readily take the lead in such an enterprise. Zoan, or Tanis, (now San) had been founded in Lower Egypt nearly two centuries before, and was ruled by a native dynasty, usually surnamed Ramesses. Joseph was promoted, and the Israelites invited into Egypt, by Thusimares, the third of these kings. Concharis, the eighth king of Tanis, and Thamphthis (the Timaus of Josephus) the seventeenth king of Memphis, were both cut off by the pastoral invaders; but they were repelled from the kingdom of Theis by Sesochris, who retained from them also part of the Heptanomis, and bequeathed his dominions to Chencres about A. M. 2400. These territories, however, together with that of Thebes, about thirty years later, devolved to Phiops, the fourth king of an Ethiopic, or Cushite dynasty, which, within the preceding century, had annexed to their dominions in Nubia, the small Egyptian state of Assuan. The whole of Upper Egypt thus united, became too powerful for the usurpers of Zoan, who were deprived of Memphis, probably soon after the Exodus. By degrees they were reduced to the possession of the isthmus only, (called by them Avaris) which they had compelled the Israelites to fortify. This they retained till about 2600 A. M. and then withdrew (by capitulation) to Canaan, in number (including their families) 240,000.

The Edomites continued the mode of government which had been introduced by their predecessors, the Horites; brothers in the reigning family exercising joint dominion: but, alarmed by the approach of so formidable a body as the Israelites, after their departure from Egypt, the Edomites adopted an elective monarchy, and prohibited that vast multitude from traversing Mount Seir, although they granted them indispensable refreshments to settle among them, were no less jealous of the land. The Amorite descendants of Canaan had recovered from the posterity of Lot the country immediately eastward of Jordan, from which the Israelites were not authorised to interfere; but as it was the only way of passage to Canaan that remained for them, and the Amorite kings of Heshbon and Bashan forcibly opposed their progress, they received a divine commission to take possession of that country. Having done so,

they entered Canaan, in the fortieth year from the Exodus, A.M. 2496.

The series of Hebrew dates was discontinued during the residence of the Israelites in Egypt; probably because they computed time, like the other inhabitants, by the years of successive kings; and it was not resumed on their settlement in Canaan (unless dates have been omitted in transcribing) perhaps in consequence of their state of anarchy subsequent to the death of Joshua. The deficiency, however, was supplied by a computation of Jephthah, whose political talents seem to have equalled his military prowess. When negotiating with the king of the Ammonites, who, eighteen years before, had conquered from the Israelites the country eastward of Jordan, and maintained his title to it as an ancient possession of his people, Jephthah replied, that the Israelites had taken it, not from *them*, but from the Canaanites, and demanded why he had never advanced this claim during 300 years that the Israelites had quietly occupied the country. (Judges xi. 26.) That interval, therefore, appears to have elapsed, from the entrance of Israel into Canaan to the Ammonite invasion. The whole period, from the Exodus to the reign of David, also, was computed by the apostle Paul, in his address to the Jews at Antioch in Pisidia. (Acts xiii. 18—21.) He reckoned first, the 40 years encampments in the Desert, then *about* 450 years to the government of Samuel, and last, 40 to the end of Saul's reign. By saying "about the space of 450 years," he intimated that he did not aim at critical accuracy, for which there was then no occasion. The successive dates from Jephthah to Samuel, added together, amount to 151; making, with 300 summed up by Jephthah, 451. This was sufficient for the apostle's purpose, though Jephthah's argument required his computation to reach no farther than the beginning of the Ammonite invasion, not to that of his own government. But each of these statements, as well as the amount of the intervening series, even though it is defective, greatly exceeds the total of the period from the Exodus to the foundation of Solomon's Temple, as this is given, 1 Kings vi. 1. at only 480 years. The amount of St. Paul's numbers, at David's accession, is 530; to which 40 years for David's reign, and four of Solomon's, remain to be added; making in all 574. Yet this appears to come somewhat short of Jephthah's calculation. It is evident, therefore, that the total, at 480, must be incorrect; and if so slight an alteration as the substitution of 580 suffices to adjust the whole period, it may reasonably be concluded that the first number, four, has been mistranscribed for five. No other difficulty attaches to this extensive and agitated period, except the singular length of 80 years, attributed to Ebrad's government, even though he acquired it by assassination. This

Scripture Chronology.

date has been very commonly discredited; and if reduced to one half, which is the utmost time assigned to any other judge of the Israelites, all the remaining dates become clear, and every event occupies its natural position.

The foundation of the Temple, in the 580th year from the Exodus, coincides with A. M. 3036. Tracing back the terms of the reigns of kings, the governments of judges, and the oppressions of enemies, by current years, the first invasion, by Cushan Rishathaim, occurred A. M. 2544, in the 49th year from the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan. Joshua's death took place probably about the middle of that interval; and the rapid corruption of the people after his decease is awfully demonstrated by events, recorded in the last five chapters of Judges, while Phinehas, grandson of Aaron, was high-priest. The defeat of Chedorlaomer and his tributary kings, by the dauntless enterprise of Abraham, seems to have exempted Canaan for five centuries from annoyance by eastern sovereigns. The names of two Assyrian dynasties, which probably intervened, have been recorded, but nothing remarkable is reported of them. Belus is said to have restored the splendour of Babylon, and Ninus, his successor, to have transferred the government to Nineveh. Either of them might be called by the Hebrews, King of Mesopotamia; and so far as the deranged and distorted chronology of Assyria admits of adjustment, the latter part of Ninus's long reign may coincide with Cushan Rishathaim's conquest of Canaan. Nothing concerning Ninus is more certain, than that he did for a time possess Palestine. Semiramis was a native of Ascalon, taken captive while very young by a general officer of Ninus, who married her, but was compelled to relinquish her to his royal master. Ninus left his vast dominions to Semiramis (who was but twenty years old at his decease) probably as guardian of their infant son. She retained the government above forty years, and resided at Babylon, which she greatly embellished; but, instead of revenging on her native country Othniel's expulsion of the Assyrians, she constantly directed her conquests eastward. Her son Ninyas, who succeeded her, preferred a pacific life; and most other kings of that dynasty, habituated to luxurious and effeminate seclusion, took no part in the subsequent revolutions of Canaan.

To Othniel's government the history of Ruth refers. In the abridged genealogy annexed to it, several generations between Obed, her son, and Jesse, the father of David, have evidently been omitted; it being doubtless well known, when this narrative was annexed to the book of Judges, that Jesse was the lineal (though distant) descendant of Obed. Between the births of Boaz and David four centuries and a half intervened. The contraction of this period, therefore, if admitted,

could do little toward completing the pedigree of David. It was probably in consequence of this known reduction, that other parts of the genealogy of Christ, as inserted in the gospel according to Matthew, were similarly abridged.

It is obvious that more implacable enmity subsisted between the Israelites and the Amalekites, than between them and any other Canaanite nation. If, as is most probable, the Amalekites were their chief persecutors in Egypt, this antipathy may be naturally accounted for. Their pursuers had just perished in the Red Sea, when the nomadic Amalekites crossed the extent of the Desert to attack them on their route to Horeb. The return of twenty-four myriads of Amalekites from Egypt to Canaan, therefore, was ominous to the Israelites; and we find them, a few years after that event, attacked by Jabin, king of the northern Canaanites, with the tremendous force of 900 iron chariots. Such an army, within a century, or little more, since the devastation of Jabin's capital and territory by Joshua, would be difficult to explain, unless by the junction of the Amalekite force from Egypt; and accordingly we find Deborah on this occasion extolling chiefly her triumph over *Amalek*. (Judges v. 14.) In all the subsequent conflicts of the Israelites with their hostile neighbours, also, we find the Amalekites partaking.

The Philistines had courted the alliance both of Abraham and Isaac, being like them foreigners in Canaan. Hostile to its natives, they do not seem to have impeded their extermination by the Israelites: but when these had degraded themselves by their misconduct, the Philistines wished to share the spoil with others of their oppressors; and at length they gained the ascendant more completely and permanently than any other had done. They subjugated the Israelites about forty years after having expelled the Phenicians from old Tyre; and although, after an equal term of uninterrupted oppression, they were harassed for twenty years by the personal exploits of Sampson, his countrymen remained in abject submission to them. Eli, being of a different family from his predecessors, probably was appointed to the High-priesthood by the Philistines; and when his sons attempted to throw off a yoke already endured for a century, it resulted in his own and their destruction.

Egypt meanwhile had undergone important reverses. The prosperous reign of Phiops over the whole of that country except the Delta, according to the joint testimony of Eratosthenes and Manetho, was protracted throughout a century, having begun in the sixth year of his age. He seems to have been the Osimandyas of Diodorus Siculus, and to have added much to the magnificence of Thebes. His son and successor survived him but one year; and was succeeded by (the Egyptian) Nitocris,

whose reign both at Thebes and at Memphis is indubitably attested. Mæris, who constructed near the latter city the lake that bore his name, was the twelfth in succession after her. The fourth from Mæris, and last of the Theban kings, is named by Eratosthenes, Amuthantæus: and as Diodorus apprizes us that Sesostris was the seventh (inclusive) from Mæris, the reign of that celebrated conqueror must have been the second after the close of Eratosthenes's catalogue.

In Josephus's extracts from Manetho, the second reign before that of Sethos (or Sesostris) is that of Armesses Miamun, of nearly equal length with that of Amuthantæus, with whom therefore he may reasonably be identified. He seems to have been the Egyptian Memnon, and the first who ruled all Egypt, having acceded to the kingdom of Zoan, which had continued till then to be an independent state, under the successors of Alisphragmuthosis and Tethmosis, who expelled the Amalekites from Egypt. Their names, and the years of their respective reigns, have been preserved by Josephus, as well as those of the pastoral usurpers who preceded them. The total, subjoined to that of the only preceding dynasty in Zoan, as above adjusted to the Hebrew dates, differs from the sum of Eratosthenes's collateral reigns at Thebes by only eleven years, which might inevitably occur in computing by current time. By assigning, therefore, the close of Miamun's reign to A. M. 2891, we entertain some confidence of approximating its true date sufficiently for every useful purpose.

The possibility of satisfactorily adjusting so remote a period of profane chronology, may surprize all who have taken only a general view of the subject; but it is to be considered that the Macedonian kings of Egypt possessed ample means for its investigation, and that they left none unemployed. Demanding from the Egyptian priests a statement of their ancient chronology, they were first presented with fifteen skeleton dynasties of kings of Lower Egypt, down to the time of Alexander the Great. To these were prefixed a cynic cycle of 15 heroes,* another dynasty of eight demi-gods, the reigns of twelve Gods, each computed as a dynasty; and that of the sun, comprising 30,000 years. Thus a total was made up of 36,525 years, closing at Alexander's arrival in Egypt, whence they chose to reckon back this grand cycle, which they used for reducing their years to solar time.

This scheme not being satisfactory to the Ptolemies, Manetho, chief scribe of Thebes, was required to make a more detailed

* The amount of whose reigns being that of the first 15 kings in Eratosthenes's list, their identity is hardly questionable.

development of the sacerdotal antiquities. He therefore produced an historical narrative in three divisions, in the course of which were introduced the names of many more kings than those comprised in the preceding chronography, and the extent of the reigns of many more than he pretended to name. Whether he expressly piled all those heaps one above another, or left others to undertake this task (which Africanus long after performed), his purpose seems to have been that of exaggerating the antiquity of the Egyptian monarchy much more than the chronography had indicated; although the durations of such reigns as evidently refer to dynasties of the chronography, fall far short, according to Manetho, of the total years which it assigned to those dynasties. He followed its example in adhering to the chronology of Lower Egypt, leaving that of Thebes in its pristine sacred obscurity.

This also, therefore, disappointed the Greek sovereigns, or perhaps some of their more learned countrymen whom they liberally patronized. Eratosthenes, librarian of Alexandria, the principal geographer and chronologer of his age, was consequently employed to supply the deficiency. He accordingly procured the names and reigns of 38 kings who reigned at Thebes before all Egypt was united into one monarchy; as from *that* date the former collections sufficed. Syncellus, who has preserved this catalogue without making use of it, omitted an appendix to it that probably contained the names by which all the succeeding kings, till Alexander, were called by the Theban priests. If the dates were as correct as those of the remoter period, they would have saved much trouble, and have prevented much confusion.

What then can be thought of a writer's qualifications for the discussion of ancient chronology, who asserts of Eratosthenes's list, that "it is unimportant, because it merely gives a barren nomenclature of unknown princes, and instead of eighty-nine mentioned by Apollodorus, who copied Eratosthenes, Syncellus has preserved only thirty?" Yet this is Volney's language, vol. ii. p. 321. He does not seem even to have known the number of Theban kings; for he calls them but thirty, instead of thirty-eight! Every thing is unimportant to persons who do not know how to use it; and hence the Bible itself was thought useless by Volney, as well as this series of remote dates, though the most valuable that is extant.

The date here assigned to the close of Eratosthenes's catalogue is decisive of the long disputed and grossly dislocated epoch of Sesostris. His father, Amenophis, succeeded Miamun as sovereign of all Egypt, and survived his accession twenty years; but most of that term was spent under the privation of, and even expulsion

from, so extensive a territory. The Philistines conquered the Israelites during Miamon's reign; but the remaining Canaanite nations might longer resist their dominion. The final success of the Philistines probably 'gave occasion to another irruption of these formidable hordes on Egypt; and Amenophis is said, from a superstitious motive, to have fled for refuge to Nubia, in the seventh year of his reign, without even offering battle' to these ruthless invaders. He took with him Sesostris, who was then only five years old; but, on reaching his eighteenth year, the young prince disdained longer to brook such degradation. He is reported to have acquired (perhaps by marriage) the dominion of Nubia (usually called Ethiopia); and conducting into Egypt a very numerous army of both nations, he rapidly expelled the invaders, and pursued them to Canaan. The Philistines, originally Egyptians, and at first under monarchical government, had formed, when they extended their dominion along the coast, a federative union of five aristocratical states. The assembled rulers of these, for the greater part, were at once cut off by the last desperate exertion of Sampson, a few years before Sesostris's expedition. It is testified that their survivors submitted without resistance, and that the young conqueror advanced along the coasts of the Mediterranean and Ægean seas, crossed the Hellespont, returned by Caucasus, settled part of his followers in Colchis, penetrated into Assyria, and at the end of nine years returned to Egypt; where, during half a century, he more wisely devoted his attention to the benefit of that country, relinquishing all his foreign acquisitions.

The charge advanced by Volney against Christian chronologers, of warping profane history in favour of the Hebrew Scriptures, derives its strongest colour from the irreconcilable and preposterous dates which they have assigned to the epoch of Sesostris. Usher confounded it with the Exodus, the most absurd of all imaginable conjunctures. Marsham and Newton, on the contrary, identified Sesostris with Shishak, whereby they involved collateral profane chronology in utter confusion. These opposite errors arose nevertheless from the same palpable prepossession, that if the subjugation of Canaan by Sesostris had intervened between these extremes, it must have been mentioned in the Bible; but the brief records of the Israelites usually omit all such events, of whatever general interest, as did not materially affect their own national condition; and at the crisis to which the most authentic period of ancient Egyptian chronology affixes the expedition of Sesostris, it was unlikely to cause any sensible change in their state. They had long been subject to the Philistines, before he acquired (without opposition) the sovereignty of Canaan; and they remained so, long

afterwards. He pursued his rapid march along the coast, without troubling Eli in the exercise of his pontificate at Shiloh; and he does not appear to have returned by the way of Palestine, or ever to have visited it again. Volney* is remarkably indecisive on this important epoch. He wished (notwithstanding the obvious incompatibility of the events) to synchronise the Exodus with the final expulsion of the Canaanites from Egypt by Sesostris, and to reduce the former epoch from the sixteenth to the fourteenth century before Christ. His treatment of this period is as disgraceful to his science in chronology as to his integrity in regard to sacred history. In contradiction, indeed, of all historical testimony, whether sacred or profane, he diminishes (at his highest computation) the narrow and erroneous total of the interval between the Exodus and the Temple; yet afterwards, to reduce this still lower, he contradicts likewise his own previous computation. He accounts it, vol. i. p. 46, to be 445 years; and vol. ii. p. 394, to be only 385 years; instead of 580, as has above been demonstrated. His cavils against the computation of the apostle Paul are below contempt; but in no instance are his ignorance of the Bible, and his malice against it, more conspicuous than in his pretended history of Samuel. That he should reject the revelation which God made to Samuel while a child, was to be expected; but in ascribing it to his contrivance, in order to supplant Eli's family, and in representing their destruction as resulting from such a plot, instead of from their own insurrection against the Philistines, as well as in pretending that Samuel (who was only a Levite, not a priest) succeeded Eli in the high-priesthood, though it remained in Eli's family till the reign of Solomon;—in such barefaced falsehoods as these, the author overshot his mark, as is usual with opposers of truth. Yet so dotingly fond was he of the subject, that while this translation of his *chef d'œuvre* was manufactured under his own inspection at Paris, he published a separate work on the history of Samuel! We have not seen it; but from the ample specimen before us, we apprehend that he could only still more expose himself to the contempt or the indignation of every well-informed and impartial reader.

Sesostris's expedition, A. M. 2913, renders some assistance to the adjustment of both the Assyrian and the Greek chronology. According to Cephalaion (a historian cited with great deference by Syncellus), the Assyrian empire in the reign of Belimus, or Belochus the second, eighteenth in succession from Ninus, was invaded by Perscus, who fled from the pursuit of Bacchus. With the latter Sesostris has commonly been identified; but as Bacchus, the grandson of Cadmus, seems to have reigned in Thrace when Sesostris conquered that country, he might be required to ac-

company him with auxiliary troops. Perseus, grandson of Acræus king of Argos, with a fleet of 100 vessels, had probably opposed Sesostris; and being pursued by him along the Euxine coast, landed his force within the Assyrian boundary. His adventure with Andromeda was known equally to the Hindoos as to the Greeks, and was commemorated by both nations, in naming the same constellations after the personages to whom it referred. They seem to have been remains of Cushites, near the Persian Gulf, who, by mingling with the Elymeans, formed the Persian nation. It is well known that Cyrus and his successors professed to trace their lineage to Perseus. Under Panyas, the fifth successor of Belimus, Cephælion records consequences of the Argonautic voyage, in which the Greeks plundered the colony established at Colchis by Sesostris, and founded near it the celebrated port of Dioscuria. Apollonius Rhodius represents the grand-children of Sesostris's party to have been living when the Argonauts reached Colchis: therefore it was probably not more than seventy years after his expedition. It is well known that many of the next generation of Greeks besieged Troy; the fall of which, therefore, may reasonably be estimated about A. M. 3020.* Teutamus, third successor of Panyas, sent to Troy an army of Elymeans and Cushites, commanded by Memnon (son of Tithonus, king of the Persians, who afterwards acceded to the Assyrian empire); but this succour arrived too late to avert the threatened devastation.

The Divine forbearance toward Eli and his profligate sons, was protracted from the childhood to the full maturity of Samuel; and twenty years succeeded the sanguinary victory of the Philistines, before the Israelites hazarded another conflict. This issuing favourably to them, under the prophetic auspices of Samuel, he became their judge, or governor, as their liberators always had been. He remained so, in exercising the civil judicature, as long as he lived, which was evidently within a short time of the death of Saul. The commencement of Saul's reign is of uncertain date; but it seems to have been within twenty years from that of Samuel's government. The object of the Israelites in their preference of a monarchy, was evidently that of becoming a military people, capable of defending themselves, without that dependance on the peculiar protection of Divine providence, to which alone their original constitution was

* This falls much below the vulgar epoch of ancient writers; but nearly as much exceeds Sir Isaac Newton's computation of the time. Greek chronology, above the sixth century before Christ, was either purely conjectural, or computed merely by the number of generations. This date nearly accords with one in the Jewish chronicle.

adapted. Saul accordingly raised them from a state of much political degradation, to a considerable portion of martial strength: and though he could not completely subdue the Philistines (who might perhaps obtain reinforcements from Egypt), he extended the Israelite authority to neighbouring countries, and for the first time made the Euphrates its boundary, in conformity with the original promise given to Abraham. His misconduct, nevertheless, obscured the latter and greater part of his reign. The Assyrians (seemingly under Teutamus) recovered their authority over Syria; and the Philistines having resumed a monarchical government (probably on their final separation from Egypt), gave Saul a defeat, in which his family was nearly exterminated.

David acceded at the death of Saul, A. M. 2998, to the sovereignty of his own very powerful tribe, and seven years after, to that of all Israel. He then humbled the Philistines, completely subdued the Edomites, and being provoked by the Ammonites, who (with all the Syrian states) seem to have become tributary to Assyria, he was involved in the most dangerous of all his wars, by encountering its collective force, which had been concentrated at Zobah (or Nisibis) not far from Nineveh. By repeated and decisive victories, he reduced the whole country between the Euphrates and the Mediterranean under tribute to Israel, and it was never recovered by the Assyrian dynasty. These engagements might retard and frustrate the design of Teutamus to relieve the Trojans, whose country, and that of their allies, were divided only by the river Halys from the Assyrian provinces.

Rhampses, son or grandson of Sesostris, succeeded him a few years after Saul's elevation to the sovereignty, and reigned 66 years. He treated with such friendship the young Prince of the Edomites, when expelled by David, that he gave to him in marriage a sister of his own queen. Solomon, when he inherited the enlarged and prosperous dominions of David, obtained a daughter of Rhampses as his wife, consistently with the pacific policy of his reign. The Edomite Prince, consequently, withdrew from Egypt, but succeeded in partly restoring the freedom of his country; and the Syrian states, no longer awed by the military renown of David, or by the waning splendour of Assyria, gradually acquired independence, and became formidable neighbours of the Israelites. Rhampses survived but a few years the marriage of his daughter to Solomon, and with his reign closes the most luminous period of ancient Egyptian chronology. Herodotus was so grossly misled by the Theban priests, that his account has only involved the subject in perplexity; and that of Diodorus Siculus, though less widely erroneous, was partly adul-

terated from that of Herodotus. Both are irreconcilable with the succeeding dynasties, whether in the outline of the old chronography, or in the detail of Africanus's extracts from Manetho. Several short reigns seem to have elapsed between Rhampses and Shishak, or Sesoichis, who acceded to the throne of Egypt about the year before Solomon's death, and five years afterwards (probably at Jeroboam's instigation) attacked and plundered Jerusalem. He was slain, and succeeded by Ozoroth, or Zerah, King of Nubia, at the commencement of Asa's reign; by whom, fourteen years after, his formidable invasion of Judea was repulsed with vast slaughter. Diodorus names this Cushite sovereign Actysanes.

The collateral reigns of the Kings of Israel and Judah exceed every other ancient chronological document in marks of authenticity and simplicity. In how different a state should we have found the Greek chronology, if such a record of the Kings of Lacedemon existed! All the dates of each kingdom are checked by correspondent dates of the other, so that a numeral error could not occur without immediate exposure to correction. Volney does his utmost to convict this duplicate record of gross mistakes, and he has greatly deranged the dates, in order to involve them in confusion; yet he could not avoid a just conclusion as to its total. The same result follows, if we take the collateral dates as we find them; and admit that every King of Judah, or Israel, began to reign in that year of his contemporary which is positively assigned to him. Hence it is evident, 1. that the durations of reigns are expressed (like Hebrew dates in general) not by complete but current years; and, of course, that they were not designed to be added together: 2. that there were repeated interregna in the kingdom of Israel (as there were also in the Babylonian kingdom, which had then recently been erected); and in that of Judah, Uzziah, who was but five years old when his father was killed, did not begin to reign till he had completed his minority, at sixteen years of age.

Without such a check, slight uncertainties attach to all computations by current years; as the end of a year, and that of a king's reign may happen exactly, or very nearly, to coincide. As the tally could only be commensurate with the duration of the kingdom of Israel, it might not have been possible to determine, within two or three years, the whole time that the Temple stood; but a vision of Ezekiel, ch. iv. v. 5, 6, supplies the solution of this problem. The siege and destruction of Jerusalem were predicted by him seven years before the catastrophe. Forty years of divine forbearance toward the kingdom of Judah, reckoned back from it, comprise those of Jeremiah's ministry; and

in the year before this commenced, or the twelfth of Josiah's reign, that pious and zealous prince fulfilled the judgment denounced (350 years before) to Jeroboam, by destroying the altar which he had erected to an idol at Bethel, with all other remnants of idolatry in the extinct kingdom of Israel. So long the divine forbearance had been extended to the Israelites; and reckoning back from that event to the foundation of Solomon's Temple, it coincides with the 390th year. This, with the forty-years of Jeremiah, which were completed at the destruction of the Temple, makes a total of 430, and places the latter event A. M. 3465.

The subjugation of the Jews, and their abduction to Babylon, had commenced eighteen complete years before; and thenceforth the Hebrew chronology is mixed with foreign dates. The canon of Ptolemy supplies a scale of comparison, but by its artificial construction it affords a contrast with the simplicity of the Hebrew computation. That celebrated geographer and astronomer, taking for his epoch the establishment of the Babylonian monarchy by Nabonassar, 747 years before the Christian era, placed against the name of every king in succession, that year of the era in which his reign had closed. So he annexes to Nebuchadnezzar the year 186 of the era, or 562 before Christ; which corresponded with the thirty-seventh year of Jehoniah's and Ezekiel's captivity, and with the forty-fourth of Daniel's, which occurred in the first year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign, or 605 B. C. From that date, Jeremiah foretold that the captivity would continue to the seventieth year, or 536 B. C. Ptolemy dates the commencement of Cyrus's reign at Babylon two years earlier, and as Cyrus employed that time in besieging the city, the difference might arise from such a circumstance. So Ptolemy reckoned Cyrus to have reigned nine years at Babylon, and Xenophon but seven; and although his *Cyropædia* is a philosophical romance, irreconcilable in various respects with historical evidence, he had no probable motive either to invent or to corrupt such an interval. The same year, also, that is called by Ezra the first of Cyrus, seems to have been named the third by Daniel. The few remaining dates of Scripture perfectly agree with those of Ptolemy; and all the former, that are collateral with the Egyptian, Medo-Persian, and Lydian chronology of Herodotus, confirm the accuracy of his statements, so far as he was able to obtain direct information. Where this failed, his calculations were generally erroneous, and sometimes contradictory to each other. So his computations of the epochs of Sesostris, and of Troy, vacillate irreconcilably in different portions of his work.

The Temple being destroyed in the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar, or 587 before the Christian era, and A. M. 3465,

places the date of Creation 4051 B. C. The difference from the vulgar computation, 4004, after Usher, arises from an addition of six years to Lamech's life, a reduction of sixty years in Terah's, and the supplemental century to the defective total from the Exodus to the Temple, the reasons for which have been assigned. Other slight variations very nearly balance each other. With the Hebrew chronology thus adjusted, the most authentic remains of early profane history remarkably agree; and to produce this coalition, *not a single date* of Eratosthenes, or of Manetho, (as preserved by Josephus) *has been altered*. The ancient Assyrian dynasties evidently have come to us very much distorted; and, although Ctesias agrees with Herodotus in the dates of the *Median* kings, his exaggeration of the Medo-Assyrian dynasty immediately preceding them, is incontrovertible. The first five kings of this dynasty are named in Scripture, Pul or Jareb, Tiglath-pileser, Shalmaneser, Sennacherib, and Esar-haddon. The last of these monarchs acquired the dominion of Babylon 680 B. C.; transplanted thence the Samaritan colony to Palestine, and led captive Manasseh to Babylon, where Esar-haddon was succeeded by Saosduchinus in 667. Ctesias, named Esar-haddon, Arabianus; and placed him next before Artæus, the Deioces of Herodotus, who erected Media into an independent monarchy. To Esar-haddon, and his next three predecessors, Ctesias assigns 172 years; but Pul, or Arbaces, his fourth predecessor, supported Menahem's usurpation, B. C. 765; which reduces the interval below a complete century, even reckoning this to be the last year of Arbaces. Allowing, also, full 32 years (with Ctesias) to his reign, his capture of Nineveh, and destruction of Thonos, otherwise called Sardanapalus, could not precede 796; at which date the native Assyrian dynasty had reigned (according to our former adjustment) about eight centuries from Belus. This is quite long enough for credibility. Eusebius reckoned the kings forty-one, and the years about 1400; but our copies of Diodorus reduce the kings to thirty; and a proportionate contraction of the term is warranted by that abbreviation which has been proved to be indispensable in the Medo-Assyrian reigns. In the Scripture chronology of the interval, no material error could have taken place.

Forty years might elapse from the judgment denounced against Nineveh by Jonah to its execution by Arbaces or Pul; and it was then mitigated, as the city (though sacked,) was not rased. Ctesias, in whose time there were no remains of it, supposed it to have been destroyed at that juncture; but it is evident, both from the Bible and from Herodotus, that its catastrophe was postponed two centuries. The book of Tobit also, the chronology of which

is remarkably correct, concurs in ascribing its final destruction to Nebuthadnezzar, in conjunction with Cyaxares, or, according to the Hebrew orthography, Ahazuerus*.

Cyaxares, at the commencement of his reign over the Medes and Persians, B. C. 633, was overpowered by a sudden irruption of the Scythians, who had recently expelled the Cimmerians from their country north of the Euxine, and pursued them across Caucasus. In their route they were joined by hordes of Moschites and Tibarenes; and by their overwhelming numbers they dispossessed Cyaxares of his kingdom, for no less a term than twenty-eight years. A part of them, denominated Chaldeans, whose name is still given to the district (Keldir) which they had occupied, near Caucasus, took possession of Babylon, B. C. 625, and established there a monarchy, which acquired and lost, with almost equal rapidity, very extensive and powerful dominion. The Scythian kings and queens of that and of still earlier ages, were called (as those of Slavonic nations, their descendants, now are) Tzar and Tzarina. Nebu also (another royal title) answered in Slavonic to Divus in Latin. From these conquerors the Babylonians (in Hebrew *Chasdites*, or *Arphaxadites*) were afterwards called Chaldeans; but the only people whom Xenophon intimates to have been so named, in his time, were those which remained on the Euxine coast, through whose country he conducted his memorable and admirable retreat.

The Scythians seem to have divided their host after passing the gates of Caucasus, and, while the main body overran Media, to have pushed a detachment as far southward as Palestine. They there found Psammeticus, King of Egypt, whose army for twenty-nine years blockaded the Philistines in Ashdod. He prevailed on the Scythians to return northward; but they left a garrison at Bethshan, which was thenceforth called Scythopolis. It occurred during the minority of Josiah, and, being unattended with any important consequence to the Jews, it is not mentioned by the sacred writers. The book of Judith, if at all founded on fact, must apparently refer to this expedition; but, if so, it is grossly misrepresented and distorted. The book evidently was written at a great distance of time from that crisis. At length, when expelled from Media, some of the Scythians took refuge with Alyattes, King of Lydia, on whose territories their enemies the Cimmerians had obtruded, when expelled from their former possessions. On his refusal to deliver up the Scythian fugitives to Cyaxares, a war ensued for six years between Media and Lydia, which was terminated by an eclipse of the sun, renowned for being

* Ku was the common title of the Kaianian dynasty; and אַחַזְעֻרִשׁ is the same with אחשורוש.

the first that was foretold by a Grecian philosopher; Thales, the Milesian, having calculated the time of its appearance. Of five eclipses that occurred between 607 and 585 B. C. for which various chronologers have contended, the only one that agrees with the chronology of Herodotus (which, in all other dates of that period, is consistent) was one of dig. 10. 33. in 597. That it could not be attended with the wonderful phenomena ascribed to it by the narrative, is no insuperable objection. It would equally apply to an eclipse that was subsequent to the birth of Herodotus, and of which, therefore, his information might have been more accurate. (Hales's Analysis, vol. 3. p. 151.) Any perceptible eclipse of the sun still alarms a half-civilized people; and superstition supplied terrific appearances where dread was otherwise excited.

Peace was mediated between Cyaxares and Alyattes, by Nebuchadnezzar, who then joined his forces with those of Cyaxares to subvert the feeble remains of the Assyrian empire, by utterly destroying its capital. The city of Nineveh was rased to the ground, after a siege of three years, in 594, the last year of Cyaxares's reign. His son Astyages, who had married the daughter of Alyattes, succeeded to the empire of the Medes and Persians, and Nebuchadnezzar confirmed their mutual alliance by espousing the sister of Astyages. Belshazzar, surnamed Evilmerodach, began to reign (as before stated) in 562; and, being cut off two years after, was succeeded, as Daniel testifies, by a King of the Medes and Persians. Astyages reigned till 558, when he was deposed by Cyrus. There could, therefore, in 560, be no other King of the Medes and Persians than Astyages, who appears, as brother-in-law of Nebuchadnezzar, on the death of his only son, to have acquired peaceably the dominion of Chaldea. Daniel calls him Darius, a name common to several of his successors, but identifies him with Astyages, as son of Ahazuerus, or Cyaxares.

The dethronement of Astyages by Cyrus left Chaldea again independent, and Nergal-shar-ezer (called by the Greeks Neriglissoroor) a son-in-law of Nebuchadnezzar, assumed the sovereignty. In four years he left it to his son, who was cut off in a few months; and his successor, called by Ptolemy, Nabonadius, — by Herodotus, Labinetus, reigned till Cyrus conquered Babylon. All these native kings are named by other writers, but Daniel alone attests the transient dominion of Astyages at Babylon. It might be expunged from the Chaldean annals, as an unwelcome memorial of renewed subjection to Media; but to whatever cause the silence of the native chroniclers may be attributed, even their positive testimony could not reasonably be opposed to such evidence as that of Daniel, the only historian who was on the spot,

at the time, himself a chief minister of the state, and whose celebrity, even when much younger, was so great, that his elder contemporary, Ezekiel, ranked him with Noah and Job. He might then have seemed more to resemble Joseph, having been raised from captivity to dignity and authority, by interpreting a dream of the king; but Daniel's predictions were not (like Joseph's) limited to the political economy of a single nation. From the first he foretold the revolutions of successive empires; and he so accurately predicted their progress, that ancient opponents of divine revelation had no other refuge from conviction, than an assumption that the visions of Daniel must have been written after the events which they described had transpired. Any body, of course, can say *this*; but, unless historical proof can be adduced, that the books were written so much later than their internal and external evidence admit them to have been, the objector only demonstrates that he has *nothing else* to say.

The vision, however, which Daniel dates at the commencement of Darius's reign, having usually been understood by Jews and Christians to refer to the expected kingdom of the Messiah, precluded in that view the supposition of its being written after the event. Christ himself quoted the prophecy, and it is otherwise well known to have formed part of the sacred writings of the Jews in his time. According to Josephus's statement, the book of Daniel must then have constituted one of the thirteen books which they called the Prophets; although the Jews have since shifted it to the third class, called Scriptures, or Writings, and with it several other books, seemingly as an excuse for their degradation of this. They have even deprived Daniel of the title of prophet, on the plea that he resided in a royal palace. Should it be found that in some respects they have probably also mutilated his writings, it would certainly not be difficult to assign motives for such misconduct. To no Scripture prophecy have Christian commentators seemed to feel themselves necessitated to give such forced interpretations, as to that of the period that was to intervene "from the going forth of the commandment to restore (or return) and to build Jerusalem," to "the sacrifice and oblation ceasing," and "the overspreading of abominations making desolate." Daniel ix. 25, 27. The last expressions were cited by our Lord as predictive of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans (Matt. xxiv. 15; Mark xiii. 14); and the Evangelists copy the very words of the Septuagint translation of Daniel, adding also an emphatical call upon the attention of their readers. No one would probably ever have doubted that the prophetic term began with Cyrus's proclamation to the captive Jews, and ended with the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, but that it was evidently impossible to reduce

the interval to seventy weeks, or 490 years; Cyrus's proclamation having preceded the Christian era 536 years, and Jerusalem being destroyed 70 years later. The whole period, therefore, evidently comprizes 605 years, or 115 above seventy weeks of years.

This discrepancy probably disinclined both Bishop Newton and Sir Isaac from touching on this prophecy. Less cautious, or less scrupulous interpreters, have endeavoured to accommodate its commencement to the commission which was given to Ezra, B. C. 458, and its close to the crucifixion of Christ, which has commonly (but erroneously) been dated A. D. 33. Sir John Marsham, with no better judgment, but with greater ingenuity, attempted to identify the close of the prophecy with the profanation of the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes, B. C. 168, sixty-two weeks and a half from the commencement of the captivity; the first seven weeks being separately computed by him backward from the close of the captivity to a juncture which the author failed either to establish, or (we think) clearly to define. Such an interpretation, however, had it been embarrassed with much greater difficulties, would still have been eagerly seized by infidels, for a pretence to assert that *this* prophecy also was fabricated subsequent to the predicted events.

The late Bishop Watson, in his candid and masterly reply to Paine's *Age of Reason*, laid a greater stress on Daniel's prophecy of weeks, than the discordant modes in which it had been interpreted could bear. An avowed atheist, calling himself Samuel Francis, M. D., professed to refute the Bishop; but appears to have mostly relied upon the efficacy of impiety, insolence, ribaldry, and groundless assertions. He was evidently very ignorant of Scripture; but happening to have met with Sir John Marsham's interpretation of this prophecy (which at the same time he did not comprehend), he brought it triumphantly forward, in answer to a challenge which the Bishop had too confidently given, and had too strongly expressed. Marsham's hypothesis, indeed, is no more tenable than any of those which it was designed to subvert: but the cause of truth is dishonoured when arguments for its support are no stronger than those which are brought against it.

Mr. Overton has copied the whole of Dr. Francis's blasphemous declamation on this subject, for what purpose we cannot easily conceive. He seems to concur in Marsham's interpretation; but instead of admitting, as he did, a competition between Cyrus and Zerubbabel for the honours of the Messiahship, he claims these wholly for the latter, who is, indeed, universally the hero of his tale. Averse from leaving the discussion in such hands, and under such circumstances, yet hopeless of doing jus-

tice, to it in an Article already so much protracted, we shall briefly submit to the consideration of our readers such remarks as may tend to assist their mature decision. Daniel's anxiety about the term of the captivity at Babylon, was probably excited by the unexpected revolution in its government that had recently occurred. Cyrus commanded the Median and Persian army; and Daniel knew that a person of that name was predicted to be the liberator of the Jews; but he also knew that seventy years had been appointed for their captivity, of which but forty-five had then elapsed. In answer to his prayers, it was ascertained not only that the promised decree would go forth at its season for rebuilding Jerusalem, but that the holy city should also be preserved to a great extent of time, and not be destroyed again till the expected Messiah should have come to establish his everlasting kingdom, according to other prophecies of Daniel. It was unnecessary, and would have been improper, that the precise dates of these events should be clearly understood previous to their accomplishment. Ambiguity in the manner of predicting them might, for obvious reasons, be indispensable. The Hebrew numbers, as they now stand, admit of widely different constructions.—The original term, for weeks, is “sevens;” and it likewise denotes “seventy.” Hence “seven weeks and three score and two weeks” (verse 25), may be literally translated, “seven and seventy sevens, sixty and two.” Seventy-seven weeks of years, or 539, extended from the date of Cyrus's decree for rebuilding Jerusalem, to the third year of the Christian era; so that our Lord was born within the last of the seventy-seven weeks; and to have previously indicated the date of his birth with more precision, must evidently have augmented the dangers of his infancy. This sufficiently accounts for the computation of that interval by sevens, instead of single years. It is evident that an expectation of the Messiah's birth *nearly* at that juncture extensively prevailed: and unless it arose from such an interpretation of this prophecy, it can only be accounted for, as in Simcon's case, by immediate revelation; for the common mode of interpretation has no reference whatever to the date of the *birth* of Christ. The vulgar translation of verse 26, “and after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off;” &c., is neither literal nor reconcileable with fact; our Lord having assigned the destruction of Jerusalem (not his own death) to the middle of a week following the sixty-two. The Hebrew is verbatim, “and after the sevens, sixty and two,” &c. The definite article before “sevens” (which our translators have improperly suppressed) refers to the former term that had been reckoned by “sevens,” in distinction from the latter term, which is not so computed. (no occasion then remaining to reckon by sevens;)

but by integral numbers. From the third year of our era, to the beginning of the Jewish war, was sixty-two years; the war occupied full seven years, about the middle of which our Lord's prediction was fulfilled, by the desolation of Jerusalem; and till then the daily oblation and sacrifice never ceased to be offered. The prophetic numbers thus translated, precisely fill up the interval to that catastrophe, from the date of Cyrus's decree, or 605 full years: for $539 + 62 + 4 = 605$. The only material objection to this interpretation, of which we are aware, may arise from verse 24, where "seventy weeks" (or "seven sevens," or "seventy seventy") have been commonly supposed to denote the *whole* period; and that this was afterwards distributed into three *subdivisions* of seven weeks, sixty-two weeks, and one week. But all that is connected with the "seventy sevens" may be understood of the Messiah's advent; and if the words were originally "seventy and seven sevens," so as to extend to that epoch, an omission of the word "seven," in transcribing it *three* times together, might easily be accounted for, whether inadvertently or intentionally. A copyist who construed the numbers in verse 25 in the customary manner, might omit "and seven," verse 24, as seeming to be a necessary correction: neither does it appear to us unlikely that a Jewish transcriber, *after* the destruction of Jerusalem, might do the same purposely, to deprive the Gospel of so clear a testimony to its truth. If the text had not in some measure, and by some means, been corrupted, it seems inconceivable that it should to this time have remained a matter of controversy. Its present equivocal state precludes us from hoping that it will be effectual to the conviction of infidels; but if the solution that we have suggested affords satisfaction to impartial inquirers after truth, our aim and expectation will be attained.

This transient and desultory survey, which alone it has been practicable for us to take of the general subject, may suffice, perhaps, to assure the Christian reader that he needs not to be alarmed at any attempt of infidels to discredit the chronology of the Bible. They appear, indeed, themselves to have regarded the experiment as a forlorn hope; and although conducted by their veteran champion, who, from a life almost wholly occupied with historical discussion, and in visiting oriental countries, ought to have acquired incomparably better information than he has displayed in the volumes before us, it has egregiously and utterly failed. Amidst all his slander of the Bible, and his labour to derange and perplex its dates, he was repeatedly constrained to refer to them, as to those alone, in the periods under his investigation on which any rational reliance could be placed. He began with heavy complaints, that only believers in Chris-

tianity, and mostly ecclesiastics, had written on ancient chronology: but if so, what was most naturally to be inferred, but that Christians knew it to be vantage ground, and that their adversaries also were conscious of its being so. If the fact needed further demonstration, Volney's complete failure has supplied it. It appears even doubtful whether ecclesiastical and Christian chronologers, with few exceptions beside Sir Isaac Newton, have not generally erred in paying undue deference to existing obscure and questionable fragments of profane history. Hence some of them have been tempted, with hardly a shadow of argument, to prefer the systematic exaggerations of the Septuagint to the simplicity of the Hebrew Bible. Dr. Hales's learned and laborious Analysis of Chronology has suffered greatly from such a prepossession. He does not seem, when he entered on his voluminous work, to have been aware how much he was sacrificing, and how little it was possible for him to gain.

From creation to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, the Bible affords an unbroken chain of chronology, either by the series of successive dates, by the totals of intervals, or by prophetic periods, and sometimes by all these conjointly; at times so checked or guarded as nearly to preclude the possibility of irretrievable error; at other times so open to correction from unexceptionable testimony, as to render only a moderate discrimination requisite to entire satisfaction. Amidst the dates of above 4000 years, not more than three or four that affect the chain of chronology, remain questionable. How is this to be accounted for? No other known nation of antiquity has transmitted a satisfactory chronological series even so high as eight centuries before our era. Whatever broken parts of earlier periods of apparent authenticity remain, they can only be adjusted by assistance of the Hebrew chronology. We do not ask opponents of the Bible to admit this to be miraculous:

Nec Deus intersit, nisi dignus vindice nodus:

but ought they to withhold the character of *truth* from that which has thus stood the test of all past revolutions and lapses of time? Volney himself could not deny it in the main. He meanly resorted to a gratuitous assumption that the Pentateuch, instead of being *discovered* by Hilkiah, in Josiah's reign, when it had been concealed (probably from the time of Manassah's apostacy), was then first *compiled* by him: yet he was constrained to admit that, if so, Hilkiah must have compiled it from earlier documents. The pretence is destitute of all colour of proof, and is ridiculous to an extreme; but were it credible, it would not affect the authenticity of the original documents, whether com-

piled by Hilkiah or by Moses. Neither is such a pretext corroborated by those slight geographical illustrations and genealogical supplements, which evidently were annexed long after the time of Moses, to the Pentateuch; for some of these appear to have been inserted during the captivity at Babylon, and of course considerably later than Hilkiah's time: but it is well known both that similar interpolations have also crept into copies of the New Testament; and that in no case they affect the sense, or are needful to the connection, of the authentic text of the Scriptures. So the second Cainan, in one of the pedigrees of Christ, was undoubtedly interpolated from the Septuagint, where it seems to have been inadvertently introduced; but it neither affects the general contents of the New Testament, nor those of the gospel of Luke in which it is found, nor even the rest of the genealogy with which it is immediately connected.

The preceding outline of ancient chronology and history, however hastily sketched on this occasion, has been deduced from principles on which a very mature and minute investigation inclines us to repose much confidence. If just, we apprehend them to obviate all material uncertainty on the subjects: but should our readers still fluctuate between widely discordant hypotheses, even of chronologers who in common are friendly to the Scriptures, the truth of the facts recorded would still remain unshaken. If there was not a date in the Bible, the history would be no less true on that account; it would only be less complete and distinct. In the New Testament one event only, the commencement of John the Baptist's ministry, has an express date: yet, instead of impeaching its authority for want of dates, sceptical readers have laboured to subvert the only one that it contains.

Of their cavils, Mr. Benson's volume affords a more complete refutation than any publication that has preceded it; and if any thing could convince those who are averse from believing, it might lay to rest for ever disputes on the date in question. That the evangelist Luke designed to date the years of Tiberius not from the death of his predecessor Augustus, but from his admission to joint imperial authority with him, was intimated by a precision in the original terms, which our translators have not preserved. What they call the "reign" of Tiberius, would more justly be translated his "administration." It is a word nowhere else used in the New Testament, and seems to have been chosen to denote a peculiarity in Tiberius's government, especially as it had been used by the Septuagint for the joint sovereignty of the dukes of Sair (Genesis xxxvi. 30). The evangelist appears to have been intent on precision in every respect when specifying the only date that he introduced; and

had he avowed his purpose to distinguish from the "reign" of Tiberius his administration of imperial authority over the provinces and armies of the Roman empire, he could no better have defined the latter than by the term which he used. He evidently wrote his gospel not at Rome, nor for its inhabitants, but in a Roman province, and for inhabitants of the provinces, who, from the time of Tiberius's admission to imperial authority, had been ruled by him, and not by Augustus Cæsar. Yet as Tiberius declined the title *αυτοκρατωρ*, or emperor, while Augustus lived, his government, considered in its whole extent, was more properly called *ηγεμονια* than *βασιλεια*.

This distinction is duly marked by Mr. B.; but he demonstrates, on grounds wholly independent of it, the impossibility that the date in question could signify the fifteenth year of the sole reign of Tiberius. That year (A. D. 29. U. C. 782) he has proved, beyond all reasonable question, to be the same in which our Lord was crucified; whether on the 18th or 25th of March, or the 14th of April, he has not undertaken to decide. We are inclined, with him, to prefer the latest, but chiefly because figs were then capable of being eaten, though not generally ripe enough to be gathered. (Mark xi. 13.) He has proved, no less to our satisfaction, that three passovers, and not more, were comprised in our Lord's ministry. In addition to his arguments to this effect, we would briefly suggest, that it is the only hypothesis on which our Lord's attendance at the annual festivals can be clearly explained. He was present only at four beside that of the dedication; and his absence from the rest, within *two* years, may be satisfactorily accounted for, but not for a *longer* term. Christian Unitarians have laboured hard to confine our Lord's ministry to one year, that, if possible, they might identify the date of the Baptist's ministry with the fifteenth year from the death of Augustus, and thereby discredit Matthew's account of our Lord's incarnation; but although, for this purpose, at every step, they transgressed, without scruple, the genuine limits of criticism, their efforts were still fruitless. Instead of proving a single point of their hypothesis, they had no other resource than to take it altogether for granted, and even to assume appearances of ignorance that it had ever been either disproved or disputed.

Mr. Benson, therefore, has subverted this pretext for denying the doctrine of the Incarnation; and, by establishing the true date and duration of our Lord's ministry, has, moreover, laid the only just basis for a harmony of the four gospels. If he had done nothing else, or if nothing else that he has done had been equally conclusive, the biblical student and the Christian world would have been greatly obliged by his labours; but his whole argument, both for its matter and manner, claims much attention and re-

spect, though all its parts do not appear to us to be equally decisive. He renders it nearly certain that Herod lingered a year under the disease of which he died, and that Pontius Pilate was deposed a yet longer time before he arrived at Rome; but we cannot concur with him in opinion that the presentation of Jesus in the Temple exactly coincided with the visit of the Magi to Jerusalem, or that so much as four months intervened between our Lord's baptism and the first passover of his ministry. On this he probably entered when he completed his thirtieth year, as John also did on his ministry, at a proper time for the exercise of his *priestly* office. So we interpret the date of Ezekiel's ministry, ch. i. 1. John, therefore, we suppose to have been born about August, U. C. 749, and Jesus in February, 750; consequently, to have been crucified in the thirty-third year of his age, U. C. 782, when the two Gemini held the Consulate. Some mistake on this subject seems to us to affect Mr. Benson's chronological table, which, with all his dates, we would recommend, in future editions, to be numbered by the years of Rome, checked by those before and after the Christian era. The whole history stands connected with the Roman epoch; and of the Julian period we can perceive no use but for purposes of *general* chronology.

A few oversights have struck our attention, and very probably the author's, before this time. He concedes, (p. 204,) that no Latin historian had called Tiberius Imperator; yet, in the preceding page, he had quoted a sentence of Paternulus, giving that title to Tiberius during the life of Augustus. That passage also implies that the advancement of Tiberius to imperial dignity very quickly followed his first signal success against the Germans, and thereby confirms the duration assigned by Clemens Alexandrinus to his whole government. We add, only, that Josephus uses *ἡγεμονία*, and *ἡγεμονεύειν*, of the reign of Tiberius (Antiq. 18. 8. and Bell. Jud. 2. 8), perhaps from customary application of those terms, in the provinces, to the entire extent of his government.

A sincere wish for the extensive circulation of so valuable a work makes us regret that the learned author has not translated his numerous Greek quotations. By transferring these (and the Latin also) to the margin, and inserting their sense in the text, he would obviate interruptions of the discussion, and entitle himself to thanks from many persons not familiar with the Greek language, who are, nevertheless, competent to enter into the soundness of his argument, and to feel all its interest and importance. Biblical criticism, like the Bible itself, should be made as open as possible to the public. The specimen before us excites hopes of its progress in our own country that we had been afraid to indulge. The dawn of Kennicott's labours on the Old Testament was long overcast; and neither the fac simile of Beza's copy,

nor the liberal distribution of Griesbach's edition of the New Testament, could disperse the cloud that had long covered scriptural literature in Britain. Bishop Marsh, with peculiar advantages, and much industry, has succeeded better; yet, from the German school, an inoculation could not but be hazardous. In the author of the volume before us (though, in every other respect, unknown to us) we find an extent of literature, a depth of research, and a patience of investigation, that eminently qualify him for whatever subject of this kind he may undertake, together with a decorous independence of mind, and a modest candour, which conciliate while they compel conviction. A vast scope remains for his exertions, and we hope that he will not be sparing of them. Whether the public manifest a due sense of his merits, or for a time neglect them, he has but to proceed as he began, to ensure ultimate success.

This happily is certain, in the highest sense, of all who heartily and discreetly engage in the cause of revealed truth. It has of late been the subject of renewed assaults, but its enemies constantly betray their weakness or their wickedness. They have now altogether dropped the mask. They ridicule Deism no less than Christianity, and certainly with much greater advantage; but the necessary result is, that while importuning you to relinquish a well-grounded hope of favour with God, and of everlasting happiness, through redemption by the grace of Christ, they offer you in return a world without a first cause, in which evil overwhelms what is good, and beyond which is no existence! You pity their miserable delusion, and intreat them to read the Bible. They turn it to ridicule; you explain and vindicate it. They then deny the *possibility* of a written revelation. If there was a revelation from God, they say, it would be universal. But what would they require in evidence of it? Miracles, they tell you, are impossible; they would not trust to their own senses in proof of any thing contrary to the general course of nature. So far the Deist will go; but the Atheist demands of him, how this course of nature, that involves the innocent in sufferings, can prove the existence of a supreme intelligent Being? The Deist replies, that this will be cleared up in a future state; but, if asked why he expects a future state, he can only answer, because he believes that there is a supreme intelligent Being. Rejecting revelation, philosophy has no alternative but to reason for ever in a circle, on the subjects which belong to man's immortal welfare.

ART. XIV.—*The Outlaw of Taurus, a Poem; to which are added, Scenes from Sophocles.* By Thomas Dale, of Bene't College, Cambridge, Author of "The Widow of Nain." London, 1820. P. 120. Richardson.

THE "Outlaw of Taurus" is a production of a very different species from the Giaours and Corsairs, and other "Outlaws" of the age. Mr. Dale is already known to the world—or at least ought to be so—by a very interesting poem, entitled, "The Widow of Nain;" and his *Outlaw of Taurus* by no means disparages the reputation earned by his former attempt. It is founded upon a traditional story, related by Eusebius to the following effect. The apostle St. John, at his return from the Isle of Patmos, made, it is stated, an ecclesiastical tour in the neighbourhood of Ephesus, in order to ordain bishops, and inspect the state of the Christian churches. At one of his stations he chanced to observe, among his audience, a youth of commanding stature, whose aspect indicated a corresponding nobleness of mind. Turning to the bishop, whom he had just ordained, he exclaimed: "In the presence of Christ and his church, I commit this youth to your care and diligence." The bishop received the charge, admitted the youth into his family, and after a due course of paternal instruction, administered to him the sacrament of baptism. But too soon the dissolute companions of the youthful convert regained their former ascendancy over him; they enticed him by magnificent banquets; and at length induced him to join their nocturnal predatory parties. Becoming inured to vice, his proud impetuosity of mind hurried him into every excess; till openly renouncing the hope of salvation in his Redeemer, he collected his associates into a band, became their leader, and surpassed them all in deeds of atrocity and blood.

In the course of years some exigence requiring the presence of St. John in Ephesus, the aged apostle inquired earnestly for his young friend, and was beyond measure grieved at hearing of his awful career. Instantly he procured a horse and guide, and, hastening from the church, repaired to the mountains in which the robbers had fixed their impregnable retreat, and falling in with one of their parties was seized; and demanded to be carried to their leader. The chief, recognizing the venerable saint, fled from his presence. The apostle followed, exclaiming, "Where—
you fly from me; oh, my son? from your father, aged
armed! Pity me, oh my child, and fear me not; you
possess a hope of salvation. Willingly would I endure

death on your behalf, even as the Lord died for me. Stop and believe, Christ hath sent me." The young man stood still; he fixed his eyes on the ground; next he threw off his arms, and burst into a flood of tears. With bitter lamentations he implored pardon, "being as it were a second time baptised in his tears," and concealing for shame his unworthy right hand; which the saint observing, "kissed it, thus purified by repentance," and did not leave him till, after a long course of prayer, fasting, and exhortation, the relapsed convert was again received into the church, an illustrious example of penitence and regeneration. Eusebius, it seems, calls this narrative *μυθον, ου μυθον, ἀλλὰ ὄντα λογον, περὶ Ἰωαννου του Αποστολου παραδεδομενον, και μνήμη πεφυλαγμενον*. We certainly should not feel inclined to attach much credit to the story; but we think it not ill selected as the subject for a poem; and Mr. Dale has successfully availed himself of its facilities.

The poem opens with a description of Ephesus in its meridian of glory, and describes with animation the festive pomp of its religious worship. During the procession, one lonely pilgrim silently wends his way, unheeded by the multitude, and breathing no votive prayer to the great goddess of Ephesian idolatry. That solitary stranger is the aged apostle St. John, going in search of his apostate son. The author passes over the perils of his weary wanderings, and brings him at once to the foot of the mountains, in which the robbers had fixed their abode. Here he meets with a peasant, who explains the apparent anomaly of richly-clad plains, and peace, and liberty, in the immediate vicinity of a band of desperate marauders, by describing the personal character of their chief, the "gallant Leo," who had so well disciplined his mountain bands, that the peasant dwelt secure under their protection, and the "blushing maid" wandered fearless in the very precincts of their rugged fastnesses. In short, Leo was "the foe of nought but tyranny;" and the rustic narrator, who we suspect was an Ephesian radical, adds—

"If he deserve an outlaw's name,
I would our Lords were outlaws too."

We presume it was necessary, for the poetical interest of the piece, that this chief of banditti should be thus described as nobly endowed, amidst all his atrocities, with the redeeming virtues of generosity, magnanimity, and hatred of tyranny—all tyranny at least but his own:—this is the regular accredited cant of the biographers of highwaymen in all ages; and we hear as much of it in the life of Turpin, and other Newgate heroes, as among the Rob Roy's of Scotland, the Robin Hoods of England, and the equally worthy gentlemen whom Lord Byron has

imported from classic ground. But as our author is a person of a very different stamp, and has devoted his muse to sacred strains, we would put it equally to his piety and good taste, whether it is not incongruous in fact, and if not incongruous in fact, at least injurious in its example and tendency, to paint in glowing colours of humanity and greatness of mind, the dealers in rapine and blood; who, to have become avowed and hardened robbers, must needs have sacrificed every counterpoising virtue. We do not absolutely assert that there may not be, in special cases, a sort of romantic honour even among freebooters; but we believe that such instances are rare indeed; and that the popular representations on this subject, which take so mightily with sentimental readers, are the mere figments of poetry and romance. And even were it true, in point of fact, that robbers are after all such benign and gentlemanlike beings, we should contend that they ought never to be so represented in fictitious literature. The injury which such representations often produce in young and ardent minds is very great; and we fear that not a few young ladies would seriously prefer, had they the choice, one of these tall steel-clad chiefs, to the most worthy senior wrangler, that ever studied on the banks of Cam, or blessed an honest community with his unwarlike virtues.

We shall commence our extracts with the following truly classical description.

“ Fearless and firm, the man of God
 The long-forgotten pathway trod,
 Through groves, by Nature's hand arrayed
 In that rich luxury of shade,
 Which blooms, where no rude hands repress
 Her own unstudied loveliness.
 Here lifts the pine its graceful form,
 And there the proud oak braves the storm,
 While the light tendrils of the vine,
 Round each in wild luxuriance twine.
 On that blest clime Heaven's favouring eye
 Looks down in all its radiancy,
 And rears Elysian bowers on earth,
 And kindles beauty into birth.
 Oh! nurtured there by genial dews
 The golden-crowned narcissus blows,
 There, with its deepest loveliest hues
 Spontaneous springs the virgin-rose;—
 And there unnumbered flowers exhale
 Soft odours to the fragrant gale,
 And waft that incense to the skies;
 Perverted man too oft denies.—

'Mid scenes like these, the Grecian lyre
 Enraptured woke its earliest fire;
 The young bard glanced his beaming eye
 On the fair earth, and fairer sky,
 Till each assumed a brighter hue—
 And scenes of wild enchantment grew—
 And Hope believed what Fancy drew.
 With grace divine, through every grove
 He saw a virgin Dryad rove—
 Beneath each pure transparent rill
 There bloomed a Naiad—purer still—
 In the sweet warbled strains that rung [rang]
 Incessant through the echoing grove,
 A choir of heavenly sisters sung [sang]
 The ray of rapture and of love—
 A Goddess swayed the moon's pale beam
 More lovely than her own chaste gleam;
 While on yon burning orb of pride
 A Power more glorious seemed to ride—
 A Youth of matchless beauty he—
 The God of light and poesy.—
 Alas! that pure devotion's fire,
 Proud impulse of the deathless soul;
 Should thus to Heaven's bright orbs aspire;
 Nor rise to that eternal Sire,
 Whose mandate formed and fix'd the whole."

(P. 20—22.)

We should scarcely have thought that the thickly peopled neighbourhood of Ephesus would have furnished a tract so desolate as that described in the following passage; but the aged saint, whose steps trod its silent wastes, was not like those thought-lacking beings whom Sterne describes as "travelling from Dan to Beersheba, and crying it is all barren, all barren." He had high and holy thoughts for the companions of his solitary way:

" — Faint Beneath the sultry beam,
 He sate him by a rippling stream,
 And gazed on that enchanting scene—
 With orient morn his course began,
 Now burnt the fierce meridian ray;
 And yet no tread,—no trace of man
 Had crossed his solitary way.
 O dear to him was loneliness!—
 For, while that mazy path he trod,
 High thoughts his raptured bosom bless—
 He holds communion with his God.
 Love warmed his soul with quenchless fire,
 Nor gave his faltering limbs to tire

And He, whom heaven's high hosts obey,
 Sustained the Wanderer on his way.
 E'en now—though *youth* might well confess
 The languid sway of weariness—
 Short rest he took—a slight repast
 Of sylvan herbs—perchance his last—
 A cool draught of the limpid wave—
 An orison to Him who gave—
 A tear for his deluded son—
 Then onward—till his task be done." (P. 23, 24.)

We are next introduced by the poet to very different scenes. The office for the Home Department, no longer able to shut their eyes to the lamentable scenes of depredation in the mountains, and probably thinking a posse of special constables insufficient, determined to send out—no doubt most arbitrarily, and we fear without even reading the riot act—a party of soldiers to subdue the robbers. The outlaws, nerved by despair, overcame these gentlemen of the police after a desperate struggle, which of course was to be expected, for as Leo sagaciously exclaims on the occasion,

"How should *slaves* contend with *men*?"

Our readers will begin to suspect that Mr. Leo is an admirer of English newspapers; indeed this line is literally copied from the speeches made and vibrated at our Spa-fields and Manchester meetings; though it loses that beautiful adaptation which it possessed when spoken by the virile race of spinners and weavers. We are fully of opinion that Mr. Hunt's publisher might sustain an action for trespass on the copy-right of his speeches, when Leo puts forth such language as the following, in reference to the worthy magistrates and yeomanry cavalry of Ephesus:

"*They* talk of justice! *they* who wring
 The hard-earned pittance of the poor
 To swell their sordid shameless store! &c." (P. 28.)

It is possible that our poet in putting this language in the mouths of predatory outlaws, intended to teach us a very instructive lesson—that this is the common-place topic of miscreants of every class who wish to conceal their own misdeeds by affecting honest indignation at the misdeeds of others.

Our author's description of the combat is highly spirited. He thus introduces his hero after the battle:

"And who, on yon steep crag's rude brow,
 In pensive attitude doth stand?"

No conquering pride his looks avow,
And who that saw would deem him *now*

The chieftain of the victor band ?
His crested helmet's flowing pride,
His sword, in carnage deeply dyed ;
His arms, with dust and gore defiled,
Beneath his feet are rudely piled ;
He moves not—and his fiery eye
Rolls wildly round in vacancy ;
Unseen the dead beneath him lying—
Unheard the deep groans of the dying.
Yet foremost in the desperate fray,
'Through the thick legions of the foe,
His arm shot panic and dismay—

His sabre struck no second blow ;
And chiefs, who never quailed before,
Had braved him once—and braved no more.

Crowned with triumphant laurels now,
What deep dejection clouds his brow ?
The warrior feels not, 'midst the strife,
The dread of death, the love of life ;
And the loud yell of battle's din
Bears down the warning voice within.
Far from his soul is Memory hurled ;—
The battle-plain becomes his world ;
Nought fills his heart, or fires his eye,
But vengeance—fame—and victory.
But when the storm of strife is o'er,
When Fancy's fever burns no more ;
When all the madness, all the pride
Of conquest, and of wrath subside ;
Then, then her throne will Truth assume,
And wrap the haughty soul in gloom.

Whate'er oppressed that musing chief,
He wore a frown too stern for grief ;
'Twas some wild passion's keener force,
Perchance repentance or remorse.

His band in mute amazement viewed
Their leader's harsh repulsive mood ;
But none, uncalled, might dare intrude
Upon his hour of solitude,

Save *one*—nor deem it strange that *he*,
Though youthful and unwarlike still,
The friend of Leo's soul should be—

Affection, chaimless, roves at will—
And souls unbending—bold—and high—

With gentlest bosoms oft combine,
In Friendship's fondest—firmest tie—
As the light tendrils of the vine,

Round the tall elm delight to twine.” (P. 29—31.)

To this amiable companion, whose name is Azor, Leo proceeds to open his heart, and to explain the cause of his remorse,

“ ‘ Oh Azor ! ” thus the chief replied,
 And deep and heavily he sighed ;
 ‘ That laurelled wreath, that vaunted fame,
 ‘ Are now my hate—my scorn—my shame.
 ‘ Their pleasure scarce deserves a thought ;—
 ‘ If rapture, ’twere too dearly bought
 ‘ By those whom Passion’s blast hath driven,
 ‘ Till they—like me—for fame have given
 ‘ Their peace on earth, their hope of heaven.
 ‘ When from my sabre shrunk the foe,
 ‘ Thou know’st not—and thou canst not know—
 ‘ What nerved my stern unsparing hand,
 ‘ What thought gave keenness to my brand.
 ‘ It was not Hate that fired mine eye,
 ‘ Nor even the pride of victory—
 ‘ No—Azor—no—I feared to die,
 ‘ Doubt darkens o’er thy clouded brow,
 ‘ And half exclaims, ‘ It cannot be ! ’
 ‘ Thou deem’st it strange my soul should bow
 ‘ To lay its weakness bare to thee—
 ‘ But mark me, youth !—nor hostile sword,
 ‘ Nor sabre in my life-blood gored ;
 ‘ No insult of a vaunting foe,
 ‘ No abject craven’s heartless blow ;
 ‘ Not the keen throb of life’s last sigh—
 ‘ Not all of shame and agony
 ‘ That Wrath can wreak—or Guilt can bear,
 ‘ It is not these—’tis HEAVEN I fear.’ ” (P. 33, 34.)

The chief continues his penitential strain, particularly lamenting his conduct in neglecting the sacred counsels of his revered adviser, St. John, who had unveiled to him eternity, and presented to his view the cross of his incarnate Saviour. He then strongly depicts his own mental agonies since his apostasy.

‘ Wild—restless as the thin leaf—cast
 At random by the driving blast,
 Each path my soul is doomed to trace,
 And never find a resting-place.
 No soft reviving dews of sleep
 My brows in calm oblivion steep ;
 Through Night’s still shade dread thunders roll
 Prophetic o’er my conscious soul,
 And spectres shriek my future doom,
 And dark fiends beckon to the tomb.
 Oh how I wake and watch for day
 To drive those dreary dreams away !

' And what is Fame, so dearly won,
 ' Whose earlier rays so brightly shone ?
 ' 'Tis faithless as the clear blue stream
 ' Which veils the deep abyss below ;
 ' 'Tis fleeting as a lovely dream
 ' From which the dreamer wakes to woe.' (P. 36, 37.)

Azor is sent to tend the wounded, accompanied with a stern injunction never to disclose the galling secret of his chieftain's remorse. Our readers will here learn accurately to distinguish between orthodox *poetical* repentance, and that old fashioned species of repentance inculcated in Lent lectures and Fast-day sermons ; a precise sort of virtue which couples "repenting" and "*forsaking*" together, in order to "find mercy;" and which supposes its subject more ashamed of his fault than of the confession of it.—But we pass on :

" 'Tis night—and o'er that field of blood
 No pale star sheds its lonely ray ;
 The morn with radiant beams that glowed
 Hath past in gathering clouds away ;
 And chill blasts moan, and viewless gloom
 Lowers darkly o'er the warrior's tomb.—
 Now in his deep secluded grot
 The outlaw-chieftain seeks to share
 That sweet repose from human care,
 When tears are hushed, and griefs forgot—
 (Soft Sleep, the welcome boon of Heaven
 To want and woe is freely given ;
 'Tis guilt alone that shares it not).
 And watchful near his chief reclines
 That faithful youth—more pale—more fair
 Than the lone lovelorn maid who pines
 A lingering victim of despair—
 What doth a form so gentle there ?
 But ah ! repose is sought in vain
 To calm and cool his burning brain,
 For while in seeming slumbers now
 Oblivion steals upon his brow,
 From his rude couch behold him start
 As Death's cold hand had touch'd his heart,
 And half unclothe his wandering eye,
 And writhe as if in agony.
 Or when that transient torpor breaks,
 And sense returns and memory wakes,
 While fierce around his rocky cell
 Loud thunder roars—and wild winds swell,—
 Amid the horrors of the storm
 Still Fancy paints some spectre-form,

And each deep echo seems to be
A summons to eternity. (P. 41, 42.)

While Leo lies thus agitated on his restless couch, "sudden sounds of fear" are heard at a distance, and St. John, who had been taken by a party of the robbers, is ushered into the cell. The following particulars of the interview will we think greatly interest the reader.

"The bandit and his troop are gone :
The Captive-Saint is left alone—
And oh ! that struggling pang intense—
That agony of keen suspense—
That mingling strife of hope and fear—
Of visions bright—and bodings drear—
When love in all its fervour burns,
And on his child the father yearns,
Yet dark recurring doubts repress
His soul's awakening tenderness ;
And paint his son, cut off from Heaven,
False to the last, and unforgiven.
While dimly yet the pale lamp threw
Its lone beam through encircling shade,
Nor—glimmering—yet revealed to view
His features, or his form betrayed ;
One solemn moment all was still—
And oh ! what wild emotions wake ;
How keenly throbs that struggling thrill,
As if his aged heart would break !
Gently at length the Chieftain spake ;
' Old man, whoe'er thou art—draw near ;
' If true thy tale—thou needst not fear ;
' If false—no vengeance waits thee here.
' What power through circling foes could guide ?
' By whom to me thine errand given ?'
Firmly the aged Saint replied,
' THE LORD OF EARTH AND HEAVEN.'
That voice went straightway to his heart—
And instant from his couch he sprung .
With sudden and convulsive start,
As by some keen remembrance stung :
And pale as lifeless marble grew
His sunken cheek's sepulchral hue ;—
And shuddering dread—and deep amaze
Were mingled in his first wild gaze,
As if the forms that frowned by night,
Arose to blast his waking sight.
So when the Phantom-seer arose,
Dread herald of impending woes,

Aghast the destined monarch stood—
 Fear fixed his eye—and froze his blood.
 But soon—that causeless awe controlled—
 No bloodless shade *his* eyes behold,
 No spectre of unearthly mould—
 It was his friend—his guide—his sire—
 That hallowed Saint—whose eye of fire
 Had pierced where marshalled seraphs shone ;
 And seen **THE MIGHTIEST** on his throne ;
 To whom with looks of love divine,
 Ere yet the chain of nature broke,
 The agonizing Saviour spoke—
 ‘ Behold that mother she is thine.’ ” (P. 46—48.)

We must spare our readers the lengthened exhortations of the sage, which extend to no less than six pages ; for though

“ In one unvarying attitude,
 While spoke the saint, had Leo stood,”

we could not expect so much complaisance from any other person. We must not, however, omit one short extract from this speech.

“ ‘ That Star of David’s royal line—
 ‘ The promised King—the Seed Divine—
 ‘ The Lord who reigns enthroned above—
 ‘ In human guise to know—and love—
 ‘ The favoured lot was mine.
 ‘ For me, though meanest far of all,
 ‘ The Saviour deigned his friend to call ;
 ‘ And while he lived—and when he died,
 ‘ I still was nearest to his side.
 ‘ I saw him in the judgment-hall,
 ‘ Denied by one—renounced by *all*—
 ‘ I stood the cross of horror by,
 ‘ And watched him in his agony.
 ‘ I marked the sun’s meridian light
 ‘ Slow darken in impervious night ;
 ‘ As if he loathed to lend his ray
 ‘ To shine on that accursed day :
 ‘ I felt the sullen earthquake’s shock—
 ‘ The heaving ground—the rending rock—
 ‘ When the pale tenants of the tomb
 ‘ Arose from earth’s convulsive womb.—
 ‘ Oh never, never canst thou know
 ‘ What then fouthree the Saviour bore.’ ” (P. 61, 62.)

Our readers will have conjectured the penitence and reconciliation of the chief ; but there is a secret in reserve, which we must communicate in the poet’s own language.

" Young Azor spoke not—yet that word
 Passed not 'unheeded or unheard,'
 Though lost awhile he seemed to be
 In deep abstracted reverie :—
 What tremors in his cheek are blushing,
 What fevered hues his pale brow flushing ?
 Those varying dyes—so softly fair—
 What deep emotion kindles there ?
 He bends on earth his bright blue eye,
 Beneath its fringed veil retiring ;
 So shrinks young virgin-modesty
 From the bold gaze of 'crowds admiring.
 Yet deeply struggling to control
 The hidden tumult of his soul,
 Once more he raised that hazy eye,
 And gazed on Leo tremblingly—
 Such fears let gentler woman claim,
 But what hath man to do with shame ?
 The winged interchange of thought
 Is quickly kindled—quickly caught—
 Yea—swifter than the sunbeam breaking
 It thrills the startled soul awaking,
 And bids another's breast be known,
 Or in one glance betrays its own.
 With instant impulse, through his heart
 Young Leo felt its lightning dart—
 No fears contro—no doubts recall—
 One glance had met—and answered all.
 The sight Hope never dared to deem—
 Which vivid Fancy never drew—
 Wilder than Love's young ardent dream,
 Is present to his raptured view ;
 Unless the spirit's chain is riven,
 And earth has brightened into heaven.
 To Azor's soul—whate'er it be—
 Like feeling shot electric flame ;
 Its aspect changed—its power the same ;
 Not less of fire in him we see
 But more—far more—of purity ;
 As sunbeams in the lucid stream
 Reflected, shed a lovelier gleam.
 Less fair the Boy of godlike mien
 Who spurned the smiles of Beauty's Queen—
 Less fair that bright Youth, when the Sun
 Checked his red car to gaze upon.
 Yet still his dim eye drooped and fell,
 His bosom heaved with conscious swell—
 Such fears let gentler woman claim,
 But what hath man to do with shame ?

Away! away! thou frail disguise, ¹
 Thou canst not blind a lover's eyes;
 Youth may the virgin's vest assume,
 And emulate the virgin's bloom;
 With eye as bright, and smile as warm,
 And equal symmetry of form—
 But *one* soft spell remaineth—*one*
 Which woman claims, and claims alone—
 It is the breathing, burning dye
 Of Love controlled by Modesty.—
 That conscious crimson blush revealed
 The truth, so long—so well concealed;
 And Leo in that moment knew
 His own loved maid, whom Fancy drew
 The idol of his captured dream,
 When young Hope shed her fairest gleam;
 To whom his first fond vows were given,
 Dearer than Fame—than all but Heaven.” (P. 66—69.)

We shall not detain our readers with the young lady's twelve pages of apology for being found in so very delicate and questionable a situation. We need hardly say that she gives a very judicious account of her whole proceedings, and especially of the reason of her being disguised in manly habiliments, when, travelling with her faithful old servant, she was seized by the robbers and introduced to their chief. The necessary explanations concluded, St. John pronounces a benediction on the union of Leo and Azor; and the poem concludes with another prodigious speech of nine pages from the mouth of the aged saint.

From the foregoing remarks and extracts, the reader will have inferred that the poem before us is one of respectable merit, and still greater promise. We would, however, gently caution our under-graduate of Benet's, to take care that, while he is dallying with the Muses on the margin of Cayster, he does not lose the race among his competitors on the banks of Cam. Poetry is a delightful companion, but a very bad Cambridge tutor, and a mortal enemy to diagrams and demonstrations. We, however, accept the appended “Scenes from Sophocles,” as a hint that our poet has not forgotten the importance of academic studies in his interlocutory excursions with the muses.

ART. XV.—*Tracts on the Divinity of Christ, and on the Repeal of the Statute against Blasphemy; to which is prefixed a Preface containing Strictures on the recent Publications of Mr. Belsham and Dr. Carpenter, with an Analysis of 1 John v. 20, &c.* By the Bishop of St. David's. 8vo. pp. 641. London, 1820.

IN our last number we entered at considerable length into the merits of the Unitarian controversy, and certainly should not have neglected to grace and strengthen our list of publications on the question with the Bishop of St. David's Tracts, had they fallen in our way before the Review was sent to press. After the extended notice which we then took of the subject, it would be inexpedient for us to offer another paper upon it at so early a period; but the volume before us constitutes so valuable an accession to the writings on the orthodox side of the question, that we should think it ungrateful to the Right Reverend Author, and parsimonious towards our readers, if we did not transiently notice it, by way of addendum to our former Review. The circumstance of these Tracts being only reprints might, indeed, seem to plead our apology for the omission; but, to say nothing of more than a hundred pages of new and highly valuable prefatory matter, which might well demand attention, the Tracts themselves, having been published at distant intervals, have never been before in our possession, in a connected series; and therefore deserve, now they are collected, a recapitulatory notice, which, if adequate to their merits and the multitude of interesting points embraced in them, would far exceed the very brief limits to which we regret to say our present remarks must be confined.

The learned author justly observes that the reprinting of these Tracts, in defence of the established doctrines of Christianity, on the Holy Trinity, and the Divinity of our Lord, will not be thought unseasonable, at a period in which the most open and active efforts of infidelity and blasphemy have been made to vilify those doctrines, and the Establishment which maintains them. We think them not only seasonable, but highly interesting to all who feel desirous of knowing the state of the controversy between the Socinian party and their opponents; and though the great quantity of biblical and philological criticism which runs throughout them may somewhat check their popularity and circumscribe their utility, yet the common reader will find in them many unanswerable arguments, level with every plain understanding, in defence of the orthodox faith. To the lettered world they are a highly valuable treasure, especially to biblical students; and we particularly recommend their perusal

to men, of literature, who are too often among the dupes of the Socinian heresy, on account of the plausibly intellectual appearance which it affects, the fallacy of which cannot always be detected, even by persons of education, without more time and patience than are always at command. It was the peculiar merit of a former Bishop of St. David's (Dr. Horsley) that he unmasked this "reasoning shew," and exposed Unitarians and Unitarianism (we use these terms only in courtesy) in their literary as well as theological pretensions, with a view to destroy that argument of "authority" on which the advocates of this delusion so frequently insist. It will be thought no disparagement to the present pious and learned successor of Bishop Horsley in his labours, as well as in his see, that his writings are less irritating, and his spirit more chastised by the meek and amiable virtues of the Gospel.

The first Tract is an answer to the "Letter of an Unitarian Lay Seceder;" who contended that the doctrines of the Church of England were not the doctrines of the Bible. This excellent Tract, entitled "The Bible, and the Bible only, the Religion of Protestants," is prefaced by a long letter to the then Bishop of Gloucester (Dr. Huntingford); the first passage of which we shall extract, as an interesting specimen of the happy art of combining controversial discussion with the devout sensibilities of practical Christianity. Let those who think the doctrine of our Saviour's Divinity a mere speculative topic, learn from the following passage the impressive and affecting influence which it exerts in a mind in which it is rightly received:

"A mind exercised by affliction is tenderly alive to the impressions of religious truth. In such seasons, the emptiness of earthly comforts, and the want of some consolation which the world cannot give, prepare it effectually for the reception of those promises of light and aid, which the Scriptures abundantly supply. How sweetly *then* are those passages of David and Isaiah in unison with the feelings of a resigned and believing spirit! 'Tarry thou the Lord's leisure; be strong, and he shall comfort thine heart; and put thou thy trust in the Lord.'—'Who is he that feareth the Lord, that obeyeth the voice of his servant, that walketh on still in darkness, and hath no light? Let him trust in the name of the Lord, and stay upon his God.'

"Our beneficent Creator, who, for the wisest purposes, has implanted in us affections and sensibilities, which attach us closely to those whom we respect and love, but which, by the loss of such connexions, give occasion to the most acute and painful trials; has also blessed us with a religion, which, above all other means, can mitigate the visitation which deprives us of them. I need not remind *you* of His promises who said, 'My grace is sufficient for you;' nor bring to your recollection that those consolatory words were an answer to St. Paul's request addressed in *prayer* to our Saviour. Such trust in his

assistance Christ had encouraged by his promise, 'Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name I will do it,' and 'Lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.' And therefore St. John said, 'This is the confidence we have in him, that if we ask any thing according to his will, he heareth us.' The same confidence in Christ's divine power to hear and to save, induced St. Stephen to say, in his last moments, 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.' St. Thomas, who in the public service of the Synagogue had been accustomed to Him, whom they expected as the Messiah, called 'The mighty God,' and 'the Lord our Righteousness,' when he saw his Lord after his resurrection from the dead, exclaimed in a transport of conviction and joy, 'My Lord and my God!'

"Nothing but belief in Christ's Divinity, his omnipresent influence and omnipotent power, could have induced his disciples and apostles to honour him with divine worship, and to endure the privations, indignities, and sufferings, which they underwent for his sake. The Divinity of Christ was not with them a 'speculative notion,' a 'disputable dogma,' as the Unitarians represent it, but a great practical principle, which influenced their whole conduct, and infused into their minds a fortitude and constancy, which made them rejoice that they were counted worthy to suffer shame and death for his name. 'To die, and to be with Christ, they counted better than life.' 'What things were gain,' in a worldly sense, 'they counted loss for Christ, yea, they counted all things loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus.'

"Their Belief in Christ's Divinity, their confidence in Him as God, as ever present to sustain them in all difficulties, was the governing principle of their minds through this life; and their trust in his atonement was the ground of their hope of happiness in the next. They knew, that 'the blood of bulls and of goats could not put away sin;' and the Psalmist had long before declared, that man was utterly unable to redeem his brother. But in Christ, who 'was with God and was God'—'who was God over all blessed for ever'—'their great God and Saviour'—'God manifest in the flesh' who was 'made flesh,' and 'came in the flesh,' that he might, by his death, be 'a propitiation for the sins of mankind;' in him they trusted as a Saviour 'able to save to the uttermost all who should come to God by him.'

"Their belief in that truth, which Christ himself declared; which his contemporaries testified, proclaimed, and arraigned as blasphemy; for which Christ was crucified; which the Apostles preached and recorded; which the primitive church received and transmitted to succeeding generations; was their warrant for the reception of the other great doctrine, which their sins and imperfections, and their inability to save themselves, had rendered necessary for their salvation." (P. 1—4.)

This first pamphlet contains, among other interesting topics, too various to notice, the orthodox attestations of numerous laymen of eminence, including statesmen, lawyers and physicians, on the great subjects in question. In particular, the

names of Newton and Locke are rescued from the charge of Socinianism; and, we think, with complete success. Christianity and orthodoxy do not, indeed, require the buttress of human names to support them; but as the Socinians are at all times studiously endeavouring to make the unwary believe that almost every great name is on their side, it is a service of some importance to convince the public of the contrary. The evidence in the case of Sir Isaac Newton in particular, is interesting as a literary as well as a theological question, and we wish our space admitted of our extracting it.

The second tract contains an illustration of the literal evidence from Scripture of our Lord's Divinity, and a defence of Mr. Granville Sharp's celebrated rule against the objections of Mr. Winstanley. The excellence of this tract is too well known to biblical scholars to require our commendation. The critical remarks on Titus ii. 13, are particularly able; and completely rescue this passage, which is invaluable in proving the Divinity of Christ, from the false interpretations of Socinian translators.

The "Brief Memorial" on the repeal of those parts of the statutes 9 and 10 of William, which related to persons denying the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, (which is the third pamphlet on the list,) may be considered almost prophetic of the late inundation of blasphemy which the Bishop foreboded would follow the repeal of those provisions. Our readers will recollect the use made of this repeal, particularly by Carlile, in the late trials; and though it is now too late, we fear, to recal a measure which was carried in parliament with little or no discussion as to its merits, not to say with great precipitancy; one lesson at least, we may learn from the circumstance, namely, to pause and weigh matters well on all sides, before we interfere with restraints which our ancestors felt it their duty to impose, and which experience so frequently proves cannot be withdrawn without opening a door to the most tremendous evils. The ultimate object, an object never lost sight of by the Unitarian party, is evidently to subvert the established church, and to throw open every department of civil and ecclesiastical preferment to persons of all religions, or no religion at all; and, in the mean time, to rescind one by one, as time and opportunity may serve, every wholesome law and usage which interferes with their project. Under these circumstances, it becomes sincere Christians of every name, to oppose the incipient measures, as well as the ultimate design, of this restless and ambitious sect. Let them remember the real character of that system which seeks to rise upon the ruins of all those fundamental doctrines so widely acknowledged in the Christian church, from the Apostolic age,—doctrines which to our eyes

appear as plainly revealed in the divine records, as the creation of the world, or the being of a God.

"Unitarians," remarks the Bishop of St. David's, "call their religion pure Christianity. It certainly is not *New Testament* Christianity. If it be *pure*, its purity consists in being *divested* of all facts and doctrines peculiar to the gospel. Unitarianism, therefore, is not Christianity. It is divested of every thing which renders the gospel 'good tidings of great joy to all other people.' If Christ be not God, what confidence could we have in the all-sufficiency of his grace, the promise of his universal presence with his Church, and his assurance that he will hear our prayers? If Christ's death be not an atonement for sin, he did not 'die for our sins, and rise again for our justification;' we are 'yet in our sins,' without remedy or hope.

"If, then, we can be content to go out of this world with no other recommendation to God's mercy,—no other ground of hope for everlasting happiness but our own merits, we may adopt and privilege the religion of the Unitarians. But if 'by the deeds of the law no man shall be justified;' if neither 'the blood of bulls or goats,' nor the most consummate virtue of the best man, can put away any one of his past sins; then we ought to give no countenance, by law or otherwise, to the anti-christian doctrines, which deny the Divinity of Christ, and the Trinity of the Godhead; and would destroy our faith in 'Him, through whom alone we have access by one Spirit unto the Father.'" (P. 384, 385.)

The Bishop of St. David's, in a subsequent page of this tract, makes a comparison between Deism and Unitarianism, which but too clearly shows the truth of the foregoing remark, that the latter is not, in any fit and specific sense, Christianity. Deists, he remarks, "reject *all the doctrines* of the Christian revelation." And what say the Unitarians? They reject the trinity of persons in the Godhead; the Divinity of Christ; the personality of the Holy Spirit; the miraculous birth of Christ; the atonement of Christ; the sanctification of the Spirit; the existence of angels and spirits; and therefore of the Devil and his angels;—that is, they reject all the peculiar doctrines of Christianity. Again, Deists reject all the *facts* of Christianity; Unitarians reject the miraculous birth of Christ; the resurrection of Christ, any further than as of a mere man, and that they virtually reject by denying the existence of spirits. We quite agree with the Bishop in his conclusion, that "Deists profess not to be Christians; Unitarians are not Christians, though they profess to be so."

Next follows the fourth pamphlet, containing "Three Addresses to Unitarians," which, if seriously weighed by them, would go far to reduce their number. We cannot even touch upon this useful part of the work, or upon the highly interesting

and scholarlike critique on 1 John v. 20. in the preface, which being among the *new* matter in this publication, we should have felt great pleasure in extracting, were it not too long for our limits. The reader will find in this dissertation some very strong, and indeed irrefragable, arguments in favour of the orthodox version of that litigated text. His Lordship has also added some very striking, and we believe new considerations, in favour of the authenticity of the celebrated seventh verse of the fifth chapter, which, however, we must also pass over.

Our judgment of this work will have sufficiently appeared from these incidental remarks, without any professed summary. It is highly gratifying to behold a member of the Episcopal bench thus devoting his extensive learning and great powers to a defence of "the faith once delivered to the saints" from some of its worst, we might say indeed, emphatically, its *very worst* enemies. His Lordship has long ago pledged himself, and has renewed that pledge, in the preface to the present volume, to wage unextinguishable war with this awful heresy. "I shall lose no opportunity," he says, "of doing all I can to banish and drive away the antichristian doctrines of Unitarianism,

‘Dum spiritus hos reget artus,’

or at least, as long as I can hold a pen, or have eyes to direct its motions, or have the health necessary for such inquiries." We are sure that our readers will unite with us in earnestly praying that the health necessary for these arduous labours may be long spared to this distinguished prelate; and that in proportion as the severity of his literary pursuits, devoted to the great object of his profession, impairs the outward vision, the light may the more brightly "shine inward," and for years to come illuminate the world by its hallowed reflection.

ART. XVI.—*Marino Faliero, Doge of Venice. An Historical Tragedy, in Five Acts. With Notes.—The Prophecy of Dante, a Poem. By Lord Byron.* Murray. London, 1821.

WE are unwilling to enter into the reasonings upon which the modern distinction between the romantic and classical drama is founded. The classification, however, if not philologically correct, will at least aid us in framing an equitable estimate of Lord Byron's tragedy.

It is in the history of our own drama that these opposite kinds of composition are the most strikingly exemplified. Amongst

the poets who cultivated the former species, stands Shakspeare—alone and unrivalled; in whose hands the art bounded as it were to a sudden and instantaneous perfection;—himself his own legislator and example;—freed from all external influence, and unfettered by any other rules, but those which great minds create for themselves;—and confessedly beyond the reach of imitation, not merely in respect of that poetic genius which carried him into the most sublime and pathless tracks of human thought, but of the form and fabric of his dramas.

The shape and modification of the other class were deduced from the canons of that French criticism which obtained a footing amongst us at the time of the Restoration, and constituted that secondary or reflected Greek tragedy, which, though frequently confounded with the ancient school, is at best but its type or shadow. Primarily, however it took “its form and pressure” from the unities, which, originating in a paraphrastic distortion of a passage in Aristotle, have held so despotic an influence over the dramatic writings of France. Its leading attributes are these:—a prologizing development of the story in the shape of a regular narrative recited by a subordinate agent, the immeasurably long speeches of the dialogue, and consequently the absence of rapid and vehement action. Add to this, the predominance of love over the destinies of the personages; a passion, “according to Dryden, the great apologist of the school,” of such general concernment, that it delights to see its own image in a public entertainment.”

It is to this class, in every other point of resemblance but the last, that the piece now before us seems principally to belong. There is not any love in any part of it. The whirlwinds that rage in the Doge's bosom do not permit the more delicate play of so tender an emotion; for love, violent and impetuous only when it mixes with the tide of the other passions, is in itself tender and tranquil. But this, to use the phrase of the schools, is a difference rather of mode, than of essence.* Marino Falerio is wholly cast and modelled upon French principles; and whilst we are advancing this opinion, we are doing no injustice to the Noble Author, who has evidently constructed his tragedy with a scrupulous deference to those principles, and in particular to that which has been called the most unpoetical of the unities. “The desire of preserving,” he says, “a nearer approach to unity than the irregularity of an English theatrical composition admits, has induced me to represent the conspiracy as already formed, and the Doge acceding to it, whereas in fact it was of his own preparation and that of Israel Bertuccio.”

The Merope of Voltaire is a drama from which love is wholly excluded.

Nor is it merely to the disadvantages of a French structure, that the languor, and want of effect observable in Marino Faliero, are to be attributed. The peculiar genius and character of Lord Byron's poetry have their share in its failure. Never was there a style of poetical thinking and poetical diction less dramatic. In the first place, it is by far too meditative, and deals too largely in generalities and abstractions for the progress of dramatic action. For in dramatic poems, the poet himself must be silent, and permit the events and fortunes of the piece to suggest instantaneously their own language. That language will be by turns light or serious, gay or grave, according to the turns and vicissitudes of the play. But it is also the essential characteristic of Lord Byron's school, to pursue a long and continuous chain of reflections, and to give them utterance in rhetorical declamations. Conversant chiefly with the gloomy catalogue of ills, which are the inheritance of man, and are scattered over the paths even of the prosperous and happy, he is perpetually busied in drawing aside the veil which conceals the inanity of human things, and calling in the aid of a melancholy ratiocination, to show that all is vanity and vexation of spirit;—that all that life has to allure and captivate is fugitive and precarious;—that love deceives, and friendship betrays;—while treachery and sorrow and care lurk beneath the charms and satisfactions of our moral and social condition. A poesy so interwoven with a dark and discouraging philosophy, must necessarily assume a casuistic form,—for casuistry is generally employed in contradicting and negating the external appearances of things. Hence the muse of Lord Byron takes a cheerless delight in stripping the moral phenomena of their outward semblance and colouring, and in thus extinguishing the credulous and confiding hope which is the sun-shine of our earthly pilgrimage, by presenting the deformities, and ruggedness, and opaque spots, which disturb the landscape. Now there is nothing dramatic in this. That nice and accurate dissection of the feelings, that moral chart, as it were, which he delights to exhibit to us, may manifest the power of the poet, who, from his elevation of poesy or philosophy, takes into his enlarged horizon the boundless region of human affairs spread as on a plain before him;—but if it occupies any considerable space in a drama, all this must be wholly fatal to its effect. If those who are disinclined to admit this to be the effect of Lord Byron's style of poetic composition, will turn to the dramatic poem of *Manfred*, they will not, we think, refuse assent to our observation.

The present production is by far too sombre and metaphysic, and abounds too much in dissertation, to admit of those light and rapid pencilings of human life and passion, which are all that the rushing tide of a dramatic action allows

the poet time to exhibit. Studied and minute delineations are hindrances to the progressive flow of actions and events. And are not these delineations for ever occurring in Marino Faliero?—With all these impediments, it may be said, that the play has obtained a certain degree of success in its representation. But such unfortunately is the degenerate state of theatrical taste in England, that the decision of an audience is any thing but an unequivocal triumph to the poet. The fact, however, is this;—it has been rather endured than applauded, and owes even this ambiguous kind of success to curtailments and mutilations mercilessly and unsparingly inflicted.

Lord Byron, it is true, has disclaimed the jurisdiction of the theatre:

“I cannot conceive,” he says, “any man of irritable feeling putting himself at the mercies of an audience,—the sneering reader, and the loud critic, and the tart review, are scattered and distant calamities; but the trampling of an intelligent or of an ignorant audience on a production which, be it good or bad, has been a mental labour to the writer, is a palpable and immediate grievance, heightened by a man’s doubt of their competency to judge, and his certainty of his own imprudence in electing them his judges. Were I capable of writing a play which could be deemed stage-worthy, success would give me no pleasure, and failure great pain.”

Yet, although we may be disposed to believe the sincerity with which he has thus repudiated the applause of the theatre, the poet can find no refuge from critical censure in the disclaimer. For, after all, a play must be estimated in the closet by rules nearly the same as those by which it is tried in representation: that is, by its powers of giving delight. Such is the habitual force of association in our minds, that a play, even in private perusal, undergoes a sort of scenic exhibition. We image to ourselves the agents and personages of the scene. The story is represented to us not by the more neutral agency and regular narrative of the epic, but by actual beings, who suffer, weep, and act, in their own persons. So that even in the closet, it is necessary that the interest in the business of the scene should be unintermitted; that the dramatic excitement should not be permitted to subside; in a word, that the succession of events should be varied, rapid, and unbroken. If these requisites are neglected, poetry fatigues, and passion exhausts us. If the poet, unmindful of his dramatic instruments, appears to address us in his own person, or, regardless of the diversities which ought to distinguish them from each other, reduces them to a monotonous identity (the predominant fault of our author’s dramatic composition), by making them the servile organs of his own feelings and reflections, instead of placing them in situations which give occasion to the expression

of their own feelings and their own reflections ;—and makes them stand still while he declaims in verse ;—it is obvious, that, instead of being hurried along by the march of events, or the tide of passions, we must be equally unmoved whether at home or at the theatre. A dramatic movement is equally necessary whether the play is to interest us by our fire-sides, or in its public representation. How then is this to be effected, if each of his characters is in his turn Lord Byron himself, declaims as *he* prompts, and speaks as *he* would write? How can we feel the breathless impatience which pants, as it were, for relief?—how can we hang with suspense on the vicissitudes of the scene, if its agents are only rhetorical puppets introduced to deliver set speeches, and to deal out their several proportions of melancholy and sententious declamation? He only is the dramatic poet, who conceals his own modes and peculiarities of thinking ; whose art is too consummate to allow time to the spectator or the reader to think of the artist, and involves us from the beginning to the end in an unsleeping and mysterious solicitude for the fates and fortunes of his persons.

Ille per extantum funem mihi posse videtur
Ire poeta, meum qui pectus inaniter angit,
Irritat, mulcet, falsis terroribus implet,
Ut magus.

But the very first step of the poet was inauspicious. His plot was injudiciously chosen, and wholly unmanageable for dramatic purposes. It is simply this. Michael Steno, a young Venetian noble, having offered some unseemly gallantries to a lady in the retinue of Angiolina, and having been turned out of the apartment by order of the Doge, as a punishment for the offence, vents his spleen for the affront by scrawling on the ducal chair a sort of pasquinade upon the honour of the Dogaressa. The matter was referred by the Doge to the tribunal of the Forty, who sentence him to the lenient penance of a month's imprisonment. This does not appease the incensed Doge, the fever of whose wrath impels him to put himself at the head of a conspiracy already formed. The object of this plot is the massacre of the nobles, and a revolution in the state. One of the conspirators, anxious to save the life of a patrician, his benefactor, warns him secretly of his danger. The spirit and sagacity of this young noble causes a detection of the scheme, and the Doge and his confederates expiate the treason with their lives.

Of a plot thus constructed, it is evident that the range is too circumscribed for development of character, or variety of action. But the fault which renders it wholly undramatic, is this—it cannot in the nature of things excite the sympathy either of the auditor or reader. A few remarks, which we think applicable to

this part of our subject, will place the causes of this vital deficiency in a clearer point of view.

Much controversy has been had concerning the sources of the pleasure communicated by tragedy. Those who have adopted the theory of Lucretius as to the pleasure with which we contemplate sufferings that do not affect ourselves, have applied it to the drama, and deduced the satisfaction imparted to us by tragic sorrows, from a sort of comparison instituted between our own tranquillity, and the troubles and agitations of the scene. But this is by no means philosophically just. Those who are accustomed to watch the operations of their own minds, will have frequently perceived, that the interest they take in the hero or heroine of a tragedy, absorbs all extrinsic considerations; that all selfish feelings are wholly out of the question; that if they are disengaged so far from the drama as not to forget themselves, it is because the drama is destitute of a genuine and awakening interest, and that they become truants from it as from a dull and onerous employment. Others have attributed it to a simpler origin—the necessity of strong emotions and vehement agitations as a course of tonic medicine to the mind, when we become weary of the insipid circle of our ordinary employments, and the rapid repetition of our daily pleasures. But the problem may be partly solved by the complacency administered to our feelings in the decrees of that theatrical justice, which distributes its recompences to the good, and awards its retributions to the evil. In this respect the profound philosophy of Lord Bacon, which he applies to the principles on which the power of fiction in general is founded, will also apply to the drama.*

“As the active world is inferior to the rational mind, so fiction gives to man that which history withholds, and in some sort satisfies the soul with shadows of things, of which it cannot obtain the substance. As real history gives us not the success of things according to the deserts of vice and virtue, fiction corrects it, and displays to us the fates and fortunes of persons rewarded or punished, according to their merit. *Fiction raises the mind by accommodating the images of things to our desires, and not, like history and reason, subjecting the mind to things.*”

Now although it may not be absolutely essential to a good tragedy, that an equal justice should be meted out,—and although the poet, of whose creation the good and evil actually subsisting in the world must be the elements, is therefore frequently impelled to leave crime in exaltation, and virtue humiliated and depressed,—although he holds not the balance of eternal justice, and on that account, as in real life, we must solace

ourselves by the pleasing perspective of a better order, where the moral equilibrium will be restored,—yet the images of things, to use the language of the great author which we have just translated, will in a certain degree be accommodated to our desires in a rightly constituted drama. If this unequal dispensation be unavoidable, and the dramatic poet be compelled to exhibit the just and the good as too feeble to resist the tide of affliction which overwhelms them;—the auditor, or the reader, makes an effort towards repairing the inequality, by throwing his sympathies and affections into the scale. And in all cases, the pleasure we derive from good dramatic representation largely flows from this—that the personages for whom we are thus moved, are worthy of our emotions, and that the finest sentiments of our hearts are not squandered upon ignoble objects. We are attracted to a skilful tragedy, because it reflects back to us those sentiments of the dignity of our nature which gratify our pride, by the contemplation of great virtues engaged in a conflict with great sufferings. And therefore it is an indispensable condition to the pleasure, which is elicited from such a source, that there should be nothing intrinsically low and undignified in those who claim our sympathy. It is also a rule in this species of composition that the dramatic poet, who attempts to excite an interest for his principal character by infusing into it a sense of suffering derived from trifling and inadequate causes, makes an experiment upon our feelings, which at once disgusts and insults us. Great emotions raised by a petty grievance belong to the mock-heroic,—and are too nearly allied to comedy, to be the source of a tragic interest. The want of all proportion between the evil and the sorrows which bewail it, or the consequences which flow from it, is fatal to tragedy.

Let Marino Faliero be tried by this test. What is it which has roused the tempest of high and angry passions in his bosom? What is it, that has called up so implacable a spirit of revenge,—that nothing short of rivers of blood, and the destruction of a state, could appease it? An affront,—an indignity at most; and that affront or indignity visited by too light a sentence upon the offender. It may be said, that the fact is historical. Be it so. But was Lord Byron compelled to choose it? The dramatic writer, if he takes his materials from history, is an imperfect master of his art, if he selects a subject which is unfitted for his purpose. Nor was our author unmindful of the difficulty which the choice imposed upon him; for he has deserted the history to aggravate the affront by a diminution of the punishment. In the history, the matter is thus narrated:

“Ser Michele thought that such an affront (being turned out by the

Doge) was beyond all bearing, and when the feast was over, and all other persons had left the palace, he continuing heated with anger, went to the hall of audience, and wrote certain unseemly words relating to the Duke and Duchess, upon the chair in which the Duke was used to sit. '*Marin Falier the husband of the fair wife; others kiss her, but he keeps her.*' In the morning the words were seen, and the matter considered very scandalous. A largesse of great amount was immediately proffered by the Avogadori to discover who had written those words. And at length it was known that Michele Steno had written them. It was resolved in the council of Forty, that he should be arrested; and he then confessed, that in the fit of vexation and spite, occasioned by his being thrust off the solajo in the presence of his mistress, he had written the words. And the council took his youth into consideration, and that he was a lover, and therefore they adjudged, that he should be kept in close confinement during two months, and that afterwards, he should be banished from Venice and the state one year. In consequence of this merciful sentence the Duke became exceedingly wroth, it appearing to him, that the council had not acted in such a manner as was required by the respect due to ducal dignity; and he said that they ought to have condemned Ser Michele to be hanged by the neck, or at least, to be banished for life."

Now Lord Byron seems to have been conscious that the indignity was too much alleviated by the sentence actually passed on Steno; for in strict justice, two months' imprisonment, and a year's banishment, is a punishment outrageously severe for an offence committed in the levity and heat of the moment. He has, therefore, made it a month's imprisonment only, in his play; and feeling that the words themselves would never justify the tumult he had raised in the Doge's breast, or the dreadful assassination and revolution which were to follow, altogether omitted them.

"Doge.	Say on.	
Bertuccio Faliero. (reading.)		Decreed
In council, without one dissenting voice,		
That Michel Steno, by his own confession,		
Guilty on the last night of Carnival		
Of having graven on the ducal chair		
The following words——		

Doge.	Would'st thou repeat them?
Would'st thou repeat them—thou, a Faliero,	
Harp on the deep dishonour of our house,	
Dishonoured in its chief—that chief the prince	
Of Venice, first of cities? To the sentence.	

Bertuccio Faliero.	Forgive me, my good lord; I will obey:—
(Reads.)	That Michel Steno be detained a month in close
st."	

Proceed.

Bertuccio Faliero.

• My lord, tis finished

• *Doge.* How say you?—finished! Do I dream?—tis false—
Give me the paper.—(*Snatches the paper, and reads.*) “Tis decreed in council

That Michel Steno”——Nephew, thine arm!

Bertuccio Faliero.

Nay,

Cheer up, be calm; this transport is uncalled for.”

So we think. It is a storm conjured up “to waft a feather or to drown a fly.” The Doge is his own tormentor; and such is the insignificance of the wrong, that in the words of Sir Lucius O’Trigger, we are inclined to lament, that “so much good passion should be wasted.” As for any feelings of sympathy or commiseration, they are out of the question. Pity, or any thing akin to it, would be thrown away upon a being inflated with boisterous and ungovernable passions, swollen to despair and madness from a provocation “light as air.” Zanga’s revenge was comparatively rational; for, added to the indelible disgrace of a blow working upon the wild and ferocious passions of his nature, he had before his eyes the assassin of his father and the enslaver of his country in Alonzo; and Othello was “perplexed in the extreme” by passions that waked the nerve where agony resides, and goaded him into the snare which the most accomplished treachery had prepared for his destruction. But the anguish of Faliero is self-born, and arises from a temperament and constitution of mind so exclusively peculiar to himself, that nature, who commands us to weep for the ills of humanity, is unconcerned and quiescent for sorrows which it is childish to feel and disgraceful to bewail. Hence it is, that we almost refuse to listen to his long and digressive train of reflections, which, though highly embellished, are so utterly unseasonable and out of place, as to be almost ridiculous. Nor is the Doge entitled even to that species of commiseration which is extorted from us by the great and terrible crimes at which nature shudders, when they are urged on by strong and overbearing impulses. There is not the shadow of an apology for the cold-blooded conspiracy which, to appease a capricious whim, and expiate an imagined insult, was to shed the noblest blood of Venice.

Having said so much of the chief personage of the play, we have little to say concerning the others. Angiolina is certainly an improvement upon the frail but beauteous beings whom Lord Byron has shadowed in his former poems; for she is chaste and virtuous. Yet with this enviable distinction over such female creations as the Gulnares, the Kaleds, the Parisinas, there is no charm of tenderness in her moral lineaments; nothing that entwines round our heart and its affections. She is a moralizing Belvidera, attached to her lord by reasonings deduced from her

understanding;—by her duties;—by a set of formal theorems,—by rules of conduct, rather than sentiments of the bosom. “How unlike is the scene between the Doge and Angiolina, in the second act, to the sacred sweetness of those colloquies which a Posthumus and an Othello hold with their wives! In reading the following tame and artificial *discussion*, do we find the faintest image of that insinuating tenderness mingled with the pride of heroic virtue, by which the daughter of Cato steals into the fearful mysteries which occupied the heart of Brutus?

“ *Angiolina*. You’re ever kind to me:—
I have nothing to desire, or to request, .
Except to see you oftener and calmer.

Doge. Calmer?

Angiolina. Ay, calmer, my good lord.—Ah! why
Do you still keep apart, and walk alone,
And let such strong emotions stamp your brow,
As not betraying their full import, yet
Disclose too much?

Doge. Disclose too much!—of what?
What is there to disclose?

Angiolina. A heart so ill
At ease.

Doge. ’Tis nothing, child.—But in the state
You know what daily cares oppress all those
Who govern this precarious commonwealth.

Angiolina. Yet this existed long before, and never
Till in these late days did I see you thus.
Forgive me; there is something at your heart
More than the mere discharge of public duties,
Which long use, and a talent like to yours,
Have rendered light, nay, a necessity
To keep your mind from stagnating. ’Tis not
In hostile states nor perils thus to shake you:
You who have stood all storms and never sunk,
And climbed up to the pinnacle of power
And never fainted by the way, and stand
Upon it, and can look down steadily
Along the depth beneath, and ne’er feel dizzy.
Were Genoa’s galleys riding in the port,
Were civil fury raging in St. Mark’s,
You are not to be wrought on, but would fall,
As you have risen, with an unaltered brow;—
Your feelings now are of a different kind;—
Something has stung your pride, not patriotism.”

We are aware, that it is an injustice to Lord Byron, thus to compare him with the greatest master of his art. But what we complain of is this, that by an unlucky choice of incident and situation, he forces the comparison himself. He treads the same

with a gesture, and clad in an habiliment, that remind us of his sublime prototype;—and when he is consequently thrown into diminutiveness by the distance, he must blame himself for having dared the approximation by venturing within its hallowed precincts. Nor are the obvious inconveniences of such a comparison obviated by the ill-fated taste which has led him to clothe no inconsiderable portion of his dialogue in a sort of second hand, cast off phraseology, which we instantly recognize as belonging to the wardrobe of Shakspeare. For instance, because Wolsey had charged Cromwell “to throw away ambition,”

“By that sin fell the angels,—how can man then
Though th’ image of his maker,” &c. &c.

Was it necessary that the author of *Marino Faliero* should thus bring the same sentiment before us in a sort of gypsy disfigurement to make it pass for his own?

“*Doge*. Pride! Angiolina? Alas! none is left me.

Angiolina. Yes, the same that overthrew the angels.

And of all sins most easily besets

Mortals, the nearest to the angelic nature,” &c.

Now we can scarcely imagine that Lord Byron, with the image and the admonition conveyed by Strada’s apologue of the nightingale in his recollection, intended in this and similar passages to remind us of Shakspeare. The frequent recurrence of them, however, produces the effect of bringing the mighty poet to our remembrance; an effect which a judicious writer would earnestly deprecate; for the brightest glories of modern poesy become instantly dim and opaque by the contrast. We had at first determined to collect the phrases, sometimes amounting to whole lines, taken from Shakspeare, with which our author has interspersed his tragedy. But as we have already, we think, said enough to account for the failure of the piece considered as a drama, we willingly dismiss the topic.

We proceed to the more pleasing part of our duty, which is that of selecting some of the poetical beauties with which it is occasionally studded; beauties, however, which so far from contributing to the dramatic effect of the play, by a singular fatality, seem to destroy it. For hardly ever growing out of the action, or harmonizing with the situation of the agents, they remind us of Scarron’s allusion to the moralizing of poor Phlegyas in Virgil:

“Cette sentence est bonne et belle,
Mais dans enfer, de quoi sert-elle?”

They are gems, but injudiciously and unskilfully disposed, and look as if the plot had been framed, and the whole drama constructed, to exhibit them; for there is hardly one that would

not have had an equal effect by whomsoever of the personages they had been spoken.* Leoni, retiring to his couch, thus moralizes upon the scenes of festivity and gaiety he had left :

" I will try

Whether the air will calm my spirits ; 'tis
 A goodly night ; the cloudy wind which blew
 From the Levant hath crept into its cave,
 And the broad moon hath brightened. ' What a stillness !
 And what a contrast with the scene I left,
 Where the tall torches' glare, and silver lamps
 More pallid, gleam along the tapestried walls,
 Spread over the reluctant gloom which haunts
 Those vast and dimly-latticed galleries,
 A dazzling mass of artificial light,
 Which showed all things but nothing as they were.
 There age essaying to recall the past,
 After long striving for the hues of youth
 At the sad labour of the toilet, and
 Full many a glance at the too faithful mirror,
 Prankt forth in all the pride of ornament,
 Forgot itself, and trusting to the falsehood
 Of the indulgent beams, which show, yet hide,
 Believed itself forgotten, and was fooled.
 There youth, which needed not, nor thought of such
 Vain adjuncts, lavished its true bloom, and health,
 And bridal beauty, in the unwholesome press
 Of flushed and crowded wassailers, and wasted
 Its hours of rest in dreaming this was pleasure ;
 And so shall waste them, till the sun-rise streams
 On sallow cheeks and sunken eyes, which should not
 Have worn this aspect yet for many a year.
 The music and the banquet, and the wine—
 The garlands, the rose odours, and the flowers—
 The sparkling eyes and flashing ornaments—
 The white arms and the raven hair—the braids
 And bracelets ; * * * * *

All the delusion of the busy scene,
 Its false and true enchantments—art and nature,
 Which swam before my giddy eyes, that drank
 The sight of beauty as the parched pilgrim
 On Arab's sands the false mirage, which offers
 A lucid lake to his eluded thirst,
 Are gone.—Around me are the stars and waters—
 Worlds mirrored in the ocean, goodlier sight
 Than torches glared back by a gaudy glass ;
 And the great element," &c. &c. &c.

There is a great power in this and other parts of this lengthened monologue. Yet the idolaters of Lord Byron and his school must

forgive us, if we object to it a radical fault that pervades the whole body of his poetry—a want of taste. The execution is grand, but the sentiments have not that purity and delicacy of expression which is the charm of poetical discourse. His style also does not sufficiently repose. The thought is hunted down to the furthest confines of meaning, and his pictures are destitute of that simplicity of grouping which bespeaks the touch of a great master. He is for ever laborious rather than happy,—and his flowers are forced into bloom by art, instead of deriving their hues and their expansion from the native vigour of the soil. Much that has been objected to Young, may be objected to Byron;—that he is not sufficiently content with the images that present themselves to his mind, as simple illustrations or embellishments, but that, losing sight of their secondary and instrumental uses, he gives them a primary rank in the order of his reflections. All this savours more of rhetoric than of poetry; and we are sometimes almost induced to think, that the place assigned to Lucan by Quintilian “*inter oratores potius quam poetas adnumerandus*,” is not very far from being that of Lord Byron.

Upon the prophecy of Dante, the poem annexed to the tragedy, we shall say little. There is nothing very ingenious or original in the plan. It is simply a transformation of some of the incidents of Italian history which have taken place subsequently to his death, into a prophecy put into his mouth during his lifetime. Of this species of prophetic rhapsody (not to mention Lycophron's Cassandra, and the prophecy of Nereus by Horace), the Bard of Gray is a happy specimen. And in the tragedy, which we have just been examining, the Doge, who, immediately before his execution, falls to cursing in pretty round terms, draws up the veil of future ages, and exhibits Venice “fallen from her high estate,” torpid and prostrate under the leaden sceptre of Austria:

“ ——— Yes, the hours
Are silently engendered of that day
When she, who built 'gainst Attila a bulwark,
Shall yield, and bloodlessly and basely yield
Unto a bastard Attila,” &c. &c. &c.

In the same spirit is conceived the prophecy of Dante, who died in unmerited exile, and is supposed in the interval between the conclusion of the “*Divina Comedia*” and his death, to foretell the fortunes of Italy in the ensuing centuries.

But the chief peculiarity of the poem is the adoption of Dante's *terza rima*, a metrical experiment, by which little has been gained; for the ear is perpetually disappointed by the capricious and unnecessary suspension of the pauses which it naturally expects. The construction of the sentences also is harsher, and

more inverted, by reason of a stanza which we have cause to be thankful for never having been naturalized in our language. In truth, the praise of succeeding in such an attempt, would be too slender to gratify such a mind as Lord Byron's. A difficulty subdued is the triumph, not of genius, but of labour, and confers no higher rank on those whose efforts are the most happy in the experiment, than is attained by that humbler order of poets whose ambition it is to shine in anagrams and rebuses.

ART. XVII.—*Memoirs of the Life of the Right Honourable William Pitt. By George Tomline, D. D. F. R. S. Lord Bishop of Winchester.* 2 vols. 4to. Murray. London, 1821.

THESE Memoirs of the Life of William Pitt only came to our hands after a large part of our present number had passed through the press; it was impossible, therefore, to prepare for our readers a complete review of a work of such interest and magnitude. For a full examination of both its subject matter, and its execution, we must reserve ourselves till the Bishop shall have completed his undertaking. We could not, however, in the mean time, permit the portion which has been presented to the public to pass unnoticed by us, as the publication is too bulky to be speedily circulated; and we deem it of moment to the great objects of moral and political instruction, to help, as far as we are able, to spread the knowledge and attraction of its contents among all classes of our countrymen. With respect to the posthumous renown of William Pitt, it has been the fortune of his character and his merit to be better recorded than those of the other great men with whom he has acted or contended. Mr. Fox's memory is mixed up with all the impertinences of his flimsy biographers, and the vestiges of Mr. Burke's great career have been traced by hands scarcely less profane; but whatever may be thought of the skill or taste with which the task of exhibiting Mr. Pitt's character to his countrymen has been performed by his present biographer, it will never be said that all the remarkable particulars of his life have not been copiously and clearly set forth; or that the vast variety of his intellectual conflicts and conquests have not been related with sufficient accuracy, both as to the matters themselves and their characteristic circumstances.

The work before us has very peculiar claims to attention, in

reference to the relation in which the writer stood to the subject of his memoirs. He directed his first studies, and received his last words; and during the busy and pregnant interval between these extremes, he seems never to have been lost sight of by his great pupil, who appears to have preserved towards him, through life, an undeviating friendship, and to have honoured him with his personal confidence. It is beyond dispute, therefore, that of all the late Mr. Pitt's contemporaries, the present Bishop of Winchester has the best claim to become his biographer. Of his Lordship's general abilities the world has had convincing proofs; nor do we see anything in his situation, or character, or in the complexion of the work, that ought to move a candid judgment to suspect his testimony. If it be said that there is a colouring of partiality in the account of Mr. Pitt's early proficiency in academical learning, and certainly very wonderful things are related of him in this respect, let it be considered that those parts of his history, which are too notorious to be questioned, are equally wonderful,—his whole life was wonderful. That a young man, not having yet accomplished his five-and-twentieth year, should, at a time of great national embarrassment, have taken upon his shoulders the burthen of this great polity, singly opposed to the most accomplished orators, and most exercised statesmen, of this or any other age of the world, with a great majority in parliament on their side,—that with a mixture of dexterity and firmness, promptitude and caution, courage and moderation, so combined, that it was impossible to say which quality prevailed most in his character, he should, at this immature period of his life, have fearlessly entered upon the responsible charge of extricating the country from a long course of mal-administration, which had plunged her in the deepest financial difficulties, and a situation little short of disgrace,—that his performances should have responded to the greatness of his undertaking,—that he should have baffled opposition, conquered difficulty, and redeemed disgrace, almost in the first onset of his career, and, finally, fixed the column of his power on the pedestal of public opinion, without a single sacrifice to vulgar applause;—are facts that would only appear more wonderful than they are, were we not to suppose the boyhood of such a man to have been marked by signs of portentous promise.

. It is a circumstance as important as it is interesting, to have the early manifestations of such a mind related by the superintendant of its juvenile studies. The case is rare of a tutor's living through the manhood, and enjoying the friendship and familiarity to the last, of a pupil so illustrious,—of awakening, prompting, and preparing his genius,—of ushering him into life,

—of leading his young hero from his gymnastic and domestic exertions into the dust of the camp and the plain, glittering in the panoply of his attainments,—of standing in full view of his exploits,—of retiring with him after the field has been won, and wiping the moisture from his brow,—of witnessing his natural greatness in his hours of privacy and recreation,—of contemplating the fruits of experience as they ripened in his mind, to the season of their mellowest maturity;—and, at length, of being present at that scene when the soul, separated from all external support, exhibits the nakedness of its real worth. From one so furnished for the task we look for information of a more interesting kind than that which is contained in the volumes before us; and it is, with great pleasure we learn that the remaining part of the work will bring us to a nearer view of this unrivalled statesman, so as to let us see what was the residuum of the man, stripped of the trappings of office, and relieved from the burthen of his own greatness, in the careless moods of private life, and ordinary intercourse. Independently, indeed, of our curiosity on this subject, one cannot but have pity on a human being living under so severe and relentless a requisition upon his powers, solaced by no domestic sympathies, and with so few intervals for repairing the waste of his energies. We have, therefore, the greater pleasure in learning, that those few intervals were intervals of vivacity and good humour, in which friendship had its full dues, and little children were the playmates of the prime minister.

We incline to think that the Bishop has done wisely in determining to conclude Mr. Pitt's political and public life, before he relates to us such particulars of his private intercourse, habits, and manners, as have fallen within his observation. Every step we take in the narrative of that astonishing career of intellectual exertion which was run by this great character, tends to inflame our curiosity to see his mind in its undress. The longer the eye has been dazzled with brilliancy, the more welcome is the shade; and the longer the look has been strained upwards, the more pleasantly does it repose on the level prospect of the sprightly meadows and verdant plains of familiar scenery. Among the distinctions of Mr. Pitt, we contemplate it as the chief, that his private life will bear this inspection. The case is rare; and, therefore, the more deserving of admiration. It is the great infelicity of man's variable composition, that great genius usually pursues a course that leaves it doubtful, whether posterity, in balancing the account with it, has a surplus or deficiency. In the settlement with Mr. Pitt's memory we have only to compute our gains: his very debts,

which were paid by the public, were in truth our own. To indemnify the estate of a man for the entire abstraction of his mind from his own concerns, and the simple dedication of his entire self to the public, no part of whose private fortune was wasted by excess or extravagance, but whose personal interests were wholly absorbed in his patriotism, while the correctness of his moral example was the only point of his character on which his profligate enemies could even exercise their wit, was in effect only to pay a price for that which was above all price, and to purchase, for a small salvage, the only means by which the vessel of the state could be saved from destruction. Mr. Pitt did much, very much, in his life; but he has done much also in his death. If we look to the operative continuance of his principles after his death, scarcely any man has lived to greater purpose. It is a great thing to say that for twenty years and upwards, this one man "ruled the wilderness of free minds," with almost unbounded authority, by dint of mind alone,—that he "wielded at will this fierce democratie" without the favour of the populace, by the irresistible conviction of his virtue and his vigour: but that, embodied in his principles, he should be the prime minister after his death; that those who had opposed him through life should have felt themselves, as his immediate successors, constrained, by a paramount necessity, to tread in his steps; that successive administrations, by persevering in the course marked out by him, should have carried us to triumphs that seemed impossible; that the counsels of a new reign, of a prince who, ere he felt what it was to govern, was personally hostile to his measures, should, by the very stress of their exigency and preservative efficacy, be drawn into the adoption of them; are facts which we dare assert to be true, and which, we dare further affirm, have no parallel in the history of empires or of man.

We have heard complaints of the want of new matter in these *Memoirs* respecting the illustrious subject of them. But it is forgotten by those who make them, that the purpose of the biographer seems to have been first to present to our view the whole statesman in an unbroken series of occurrences; just as in a colossal statue its grand proportions should first unfold themselves in all their magnitude, and bring its plenitude of effect to bear upon the eye, which may afterwards, with superadded delight, expatiate in detail over the particular features, and admire the contributory tendency of every softer touch to mellow the general lustre and to consummate its moral impression. If ever there lived the man whose public life formed a whole, by the consistency and agreement of its parts, and by its subordination to the influence of uniform principles, it was that of this great minister.

To call him a party man would betray great ignorance of his character and his practice. He was a party man in so far as the attachment of a large number of his countrymen to the steady principles of his administration,—or the consolidated opposition of men united for his overthrow, without regard to the qualities of measures,—or the commanding attraction of his great personal ascendancy, could constitute a party man; but, if it is the distinguishing attribute of the man who rises above party, that he promulgates his principles with decided clearness, and adheres to them with individual constancy,—that, without a self-flattering estimate of his own understanding, he depends with confidence on his judgment,—that while he knows how to appreciate counsel, he knows how to value rightly the dictates of his own independent soul, then surely Mr. Pitt was a man rising high above party and its humiliating engagements. It, therefore, appears to us that the only way of doing justice to Mr. Pitt as a statesman, was to place, as the Bishop has done, his entire political life, in all its bearings and connection, before his readers, to enable them to take in at a view that vast system with which he identified himself, and which has passed, and will pass, to posterity with his high and honourable name, as its designation and its voucher.

Nor do we see any way in which this entire exhibition of what was thus uniform and constant could have been made by his biographer, but by a consecutive narrative of Mr. Pitt's great political measures, and the national events in which he was more deeply and personally implicated, in respect of his responsibility, than any other living person, as they successively occurred in the course of his administration. The stormy scenes, through which he piloted the vessel of the State, are depicted, by the author of this work, with due effect, and with much natural and simple strength,—as a bishop should write when the facts which he has to record stand in no need of colouring to interest either the head or the heart in their favour. It were idle to expect many things new in this part of the work; the effulgent path of Mr. Pitt lies all gloriously open to the view of his countrymen; there are no intrigues to develop—no plots to unravel—no cabals to expose—no paltry barter or traffic of principles or talents: his primary contest, single-handed, with the coalition faction, characterised by his late Majesty as “desperate and wicked”—his restoration of the revenue—his management of the great question of the regency—his permanent system of finance—his arrangements for India—his constitutional settlement of Ireland—his part in the legislative steps for abolishing the traffic in slaves—and lastly, his magnanimous and successful resistance to the dire contagion of French revolutionary prin-

ciples, were all transactions more or less vital to the State, in which every step of the procedure was marked and prominent, all conducted and impelled by the agency of an indomitable resolution and decisiveness of character, in the broad day-light of undissembled motives and avowed principles.

But it would be very untrue of this work to say, that it brings to light nothing new concerning Mr. Pitt. It contains information which can come with authority only from the present biographer. It lets us some way at least into the secrets of that education which preceded, it would be too much to say produced, a maturity so unexampled. It shows us some of the germs and buds, which, with scarcely an interval of efflorescence, leaped into life, impatient of nature's process, and attained at once to privileged perfection. We should certainly have been glad to have seen more particulars of this early part of Mr. Pitt's life, and shall hope that, when the Bishop enters upon the promised details of this portion of his work, he will not forget that it is as gratifying as it is instructive to be informed, not only what were the early predilections and tastes of a man of such extraordinary destinies, but what were the works of intellect which had the credit or glory of contributing to stock such a mind with its first literary ideas, and of laying the foundation of that power and abundance of expression, which was one day to hold in willing captivity the freest and most fastidious auditory in the world through hours of dry detail, or elaborate argumentation.

It seems also to us that the Right Reverend Author has mixed up with his narrative of the great transactions of the statesman many minor incidents very descriptive of the man. These incidents are such as are immediately connected with the transactions themselves, and are illustrative of the moral attitude and tone of the great mind we are contemplating while engaged in the most critical and responsible undertakings. It is in these parts of the narrative that our admiration of this eminent person is principally excited, by the proofs they afford of that mastery of himself,—that intellectual security in the midst of hostile criticism and party rage,—that quiescent command of his resources, and that tranquillity of temper, which distinguished him from all his allies and competitors, and has forced from his enemies the despairing confession, that never once during all his conflicts with men of the sharpest wits of which this country has had to boast, could ridicule find an opening for a successful attack, or malice for triumphant confutation. The shortness of the time taken for preparing himself for his most distinguished efforts in the House is surprising; and we owe to his present biographer, an instance or two of his rapidity in summoning

and gathering, as it were, to a point, all the outspread resources of his intellect, that we could only have believed to be possible upon the personal authority of the relator. "The morning of the day on which Mr. Pitt was to make his great financial speech, including his arrangements for establishing the sinking fund, was passed in providing the calculations which he had to state, and in examining the resolutions which he had to move; at last he said he would go and take a short walk by himself, that he might arrange in his mind what he had to say in the House. He returned in a quarter of an hour and told me he believed he was prepared. After dressing himself, he ordered dinner to be sent up; and learning at that moment that his sister (who was then living in the house with him) and a lady with her, were going to dine at the same early hour, he desired that their dinner might be sent up with his, that they might dine together. He passed nearly an hour with these ladies and several friends who called in their way to the House, talking with his usual liveliness and gaiety, as if he had nothing on his mind. He then went immediately to the House of Commons, and made his "elaborate and far-extended speech," as Mr. Fox called it, "without one omission or error."

It must be owned that, of this sort of anecdote the sprinkling is but thin over the extended surface of the two quartos already published, but we trust the Bishop has a great many such in store for us. It will be with the greatest eagerness, therefore, that we shall rush to the perusal of the third volume when published, and shall hope to find that his Lordship will have so far held himself absolved from any rules, whatever they may be, by which critics have hedged in the province of the biographer, as to give us all that his recollections or notes can furnish of the table-talk, the social sentiments, the tastes, the predilections, the amusements, the moral and literary remarks, the opinions as to books and men, of this admirable person; and almost any look, and gesture, and expression, which denoted or developed the state of his mind and feelings during the concluding hours of his life. If this shall be the description and character of the remaining part of the work, we are persuaded our readers will feel the propriety of the defence we have set up for the plan which we understand the Bishop of Winchester to have adopted, of displaying, first, the qualities which seemed to place all the world at a distance from this great person, and afterwards, those which made it delightful to live within the circle of his intercourse.

In reading the Bishop's account of the education, studies, and early habits of Mr. Pitt, we cannot help remarking, that it is but just to suppose that a certain serious part of the system of *ital.* culture may have operated to have given him that dili-

gence and exactness in the conduct of business which gained him in so remarkable a degree the confidence of the public; and was, in fact, one of the principal grounds of that involuntary predilection by which, in the midst of all the noisy popularity which accompanied the walk of his great opponent, Mr. Fox, he held, as by a charm, the understanding and rational voice of the country. We learn from his right reverend biographer that he read and studied the Scriptures with peculiar attention, and was regular in his attendance at chapel; and we know that, however by the force of an overwhelming weight of public business, the sentiments and principles first nurtured in his mind by the habits alluded to, may have been driven from his thoughts, they did, in fact, meet him again when he stood most in need of them, and cast a gleam of holy comfort upon the last moments of his existence. A principle so active at the commencement and conclusion of life could not be entirely dormant during the course of it; accordingly, we find Mr. Pitt, in every discussion in which the interests of religion, or the dignity of eternal truth, or the moral ends of social institutions, came directly or incidentally under consideration, invariably taking his stand at that post where every Christian is bound to keep watch and ward. His whole political life bore the impression of his early culture; and transcendent as were his talents for business, and his powers of eloquence, it was evident that his remarkable hold of the public opinion was in no small degree owing to the influence of his private worth. The characters opposed to him could bear no comparison with him in this respect. Mr. Fox had some kindly qualities, and was good-humoured to his eulogists and flatterers, but his virtues were such as required neither sacrifice nor self-control; in a moral view his example was extremely pernicious, and society owed him nothing as a man or as a Christian: Mr. Sheridan was a man of depraved manners and gross addictions; his extraordinary talents corruscated round his party with short and intermittent flashes, but his character was like a spell about it that helped to perpetuate its ill success. It did not seem that either of these eminent persons loved their country enough to feel the importance of its mind and character; they insulted its institutions by their examples, and appeared ready to hazard all in the desperate game of their party politics. Of party they were the champions, and to party they were the martyrs, for neither the prince nor the people would trust them; and, while clamour followed at their heels, confidence and esteem were crowning their rival. Mr. Pitt was not the "Man of the People;" but he was the man *for* the people. He had their homage—his opponents had their huzzas; his popularity was anchored deep in the mind of the country—that of

his political rivals floated on the stormy surface of passion and delusion. In a country so capable as England of understanding and appreciating public men, and so full of a certain sagacity in affairs, the fruit of experience, practical efficiency in the serious business of government, must be the recommendation of her statesmen; for serious business we look for sober men, and, whatever vain distinctions the philosopher may make between public and private principle, the honest vulgar know much better; they will not believe themselves safe under an administration the elements of which are morally unsound.

There is always, moreover, something of a prostitute character in a devoted party-man. The interest of his country holds in his mind a secondary place; it is his creed that men are to be considered before measures. His country serves him only as a thing to talk about and to cover his real aims. Virtue and vice lose their proper names and distinctions. Actions are characterised by the colours to which they belong, and right and wrong are miserably confounded. That men of certain principles should act in conjunction may be justifiable and useful, but a factious and systematic opposition, proceeding on the avowed maxims of that of which Mr. Fox and Mr. Sheridan were the leaders, could not but be detrimental to the interests of public and private virtue. That could not but be a dishonest confederacy, and fraught with an immediate tendency to demoralize the nation, by which men were pledged to each other to embarrass Government, to foster discontent, to propagate delusion, to disparage victories, to aggravate calamity, and to vilify honest men, wherever so to do was thought to be conducive to the ultimate success of what was called the party in opposition. Mr. Pitt was, by his education and by his genius, as well as by his disposition and temper, above these trammels. His mind took its first infusion of political principle from a man remarkable for his stern independence of thinking,—from one who, for a course of years, was seated on a loftier eminence of mental command over his contemporaries than any statesman that had gone before him: for, of Lord Chatham, it is not too much to say, that his superiority to the men of his time was such, and so irresistible the combination of his eloquence, his character, his manner, his voice, his countenance, that every thing was his by challenge, by right, and by surrender, which others gain by persuasion, by compromise, and by concession. His son early imbibed from him the same rudiments of greatness; and the remarkable difference between his first access to power and that of his great rivals, Mr. Burke, Mr. Fox, and Mr. Sheridan, was this, that *they were introduced, he came alone and unattended; he entered at once into conflict with those men of great stature, with his*

single staff, against their spears, which were like weavers' beams; nor was there any one to bear a shield before him, or herald to proclaim his approach. His father's name was rather of detriment than advantage to him; it placed him at once under a comparison which would have disparaged any powers but his; and, as if all things conspired to crush him under the weight of premature success and sudden responsibility, he stood, at five-and-twenty, the single column on which the fate of the empire reposed, with the ground trembling beneath him, and the elements raging around him.

Mr. Burke's youth was a season of preparation, and the mediocrity of his fortune saved him from a premature trial of his strength. The costly apparatus of his great intellect was all ready for use and application before he came forth into public life; it is true he melted and commanded patronage; but it is true that he obtained it: great as were his powers they were enlisted in the cause of party; and, even after they came out in all the dignity and effulgence of their own peculiar lustre, they enlightened, but they did not lead; they pointed out the rocks and the shallows, but they did not steer the vessel. The youth of Mr. Fox was a long season of irresponsible exertion; to overthrow the power that first brought him into notice and into action, in the sunshine of which he first grew and expanded, was from the time he discovered its weakness and his own strength, the employment of all his energies. This lasted through a course of years, ending in a victory which he first disgraced by a coalition with his adversary, and then lost by his ill use of the power it gave him. By the sentence of his Sovereign, or as some would say, of the great and intelligent public, perhaps by their joint decree, he was condemned to be a "brilliant debater," the most brilliant, indeed, that the world ever produced, for the rest of his life; save some short intervals, in which little was done to distinguish him, and what was best done, was done most in imitation of his much calumniated rival, as if to bear the strongest testimony to the ascendancy of that rival, and to justify the choice which had decided their fortunes. Of Mr. Sheridan, who, from a vortex of festivity, folly, and inebriety, from a course of shifts and difficulties, want and waste, negligence and distress, was suddenly introduced into the great council of the nation, it would argue much ignorance, or prejudice, not to admit the prodigious natural powers. But he was altogether the son and disciple of faction, a determined party-man, and in general pledged "jurare in verba magistri." His best exertions, too, were characterised by art and contrivance, and studied effect; the odour of the theatre accompanied them, and a spurious splen-

dour invested them. In his life was practically evinced the necessity of a moral substratum to support the efforts of genius, and to give them their worth and efficacy. His triumphs were fugitive; and even the gratitude, which his occasional displays of patriotism inspired, never mellowed into national esteem. He was incapable of fixing his ascendancy, or of confirming his authority, or of accumulating favour; his course was dazzling, vibrating, and discontinuous; as bright in the morning, as in the meridian of his life; till in conclusion he sunk into a sort of twilight in which he was scarcely discernible from the mass, and in which the shadows of his departed glory beckoned him to his grave. Mr. Pitt entered at once upon his great trial before the public, and came out of it with the sentence of mankind in his favour. 'Every thing in the condition of the State required renovation and repair, and his first task was the most unpopular imaginable,—that of restoring the revenue by a vast addition to the public burthens. A quick succession of difficulties, such as would have overwhelmed any other man of mature age and experience, served only to draw out the capabilities of his young mind, and to place him upon a par with each exigency as it arose. He scarcely divided his responsibility with others, so much was each great measure notoriously his own, and so thoroughly did he develope and embrace all its political bearings. But he had not only to digest, but to defend every procedure against an irritated and determined opposition, combining their talents to sift and expose it; and capable, by their great ingenuity, eloquence, and experience, of putting it to the severest tests. In all these contests, however, it was manifest to the world, that Mr. Pitt stood upon a ground from which nothing could remove him,—a familiar business-like acquaintance with his whole subject, in all its details, in all its relations, and in all its facts. Every thing was subordinate to this truth and accuracy of fact,—this precision and felicity in the handling of his subject; so that his speeches, full and flowing, and argumentative as they were, produced satisfaction without satiety, and delight without the dissipation of thought. There was no instance of the House expressing weariness or impatience under any demand made upon its time by his treatment of the most extensive subjects. From the first moment to the last of his political career, the tide of his eloquence was observed to be always full without overflowing, "magna non nimia, plena non tumida, lata non luxuriosa;" the plenitude of his first years, neither needed expansion, nor suffered diminution; whatever was the level of his subject, to that his mind rose, and there it stopped. A certain high-minded disinterestedness of cha-

racter was wrought into his manner, and transpired in his lofty declamation; but that which was in others, the evident effect of art and study, was too easily produced, and too much in harmony with the virtuous tone of his behaviour in public and in private, to be suspected. As he made no sacrifices to temporary effect, but kept himself at an altitude above the atmosphere in which vulgar ambition inhales the breeze of popular favour, he was thoroughly credited in all he advanced; and perhaps there never existed an orator, with such powers of expression, whose exertions of them have been less accompanied by the suspicion of his abusing them to selfish purposes. But however true to the question, however faithful to his subject, Mr. Pitt never failed to adorn it with the treasures of his chastised imagination. We have still sounding in our ears his perfect tones, his rich and rounded diction, his continuous flow, his volume, his vigour, his distinctness, his perspicuity, his copiousness, his ease, his grace, which made it an easy thing to follow his luminous track through all the variety of his details and expositions, and all the mazes of his most expanded arguments.

We will now lay before our readers the Bishop of Winchester's account of the early studies of Mr. Pitt, which will have the air of romance, unless we keep our eye on the figure which he afterwards made. It is much less astonishing that his youthful attainments should be so great, than that those of Mr. Sheridan should have been so little, if we are to credit what is related of his slow progress at Harrow school.

"Although Mr. Pitt was little more than fourteen years of age, when he went to reside at the university, and had laboured under the disadvantage of frequent ill health, the knowledge which he then possessed, was very considerable; and in particular, his proficiency in the learned languages was probably greater than ever was acquired by any other person in such early youth. In Latin authors he seldom met with difficulty; and it was no uncommon thing for him to read into English six or seven pages of Thucydides, which he had not previously seen, without more than two or three mistakes, and sometimes without even one." He had such an exactness in discriminating the sense of words, and so peculiar penetration in seizing at once, the meaning of a writer, that, as was justly observed by Mr. Wilson, he never seemed to learn, but only to recollect. Whenever he did err in rendering a sentence, it was owing to the want of a correct knowledge of grammar, without which no language can be perfectly understood. This defect, too common in a private education, it was my immediate endeavour to supply; and he was not only soon master of all the ordinary rules of grammar, but taking great pleasure in the philological disquisitions of critics and commentators, he became deeply versed in the niceties of construction and peculiarities of idiom, both in the

Latin and Greek languages. He had also read the first six books of Euclid's Elements, Plane Trigonometry, the elementary parts of Algebra, and the two quarto volumes of Rutherford's Natural Philosophy, a work in some degree of repute while Mr. Wilson was a student at Cambridge, but afterwards laid aside.

"Nor was it in learning only, that Mr. Pitt was so much superior to persons of his age. Though a boy in years and appearance, his manners were formed, and his behaviour manly. He mixed in conversation with unaffected vivacity; and delivered his sentiments with perfect ease, equally free from shyness and flippancy, and always with strict attention to propriety and decorum. Lord Chatham, who could not but be aware of the powers of his son's mind and understanding, had encouraged him to talk without reserve upon every subject, which frequently afforded opportunity for conveying useful information and just notions of persons and things. When his lordship's health would permit, he never suffered a day to pass without giving instruction of some sort to his children; and seldom without reading a chapter of the Bible with them. He must indeed be considered as having contributed largely to that fund of knowledge, and to those other advantages, with which Mr. Pitt entered upon his academical life.

"The effects of a very serious illness, with which Mr. Pitt was attacked soon after he went to the university in 1773, occasioned him to reside but little at Cambridge in the first three years. This illness, which confined him nearly two months, and at last reduced him to so weak a state, that, after he was convalescent, he was four days in travelling to London, seems to have been a crisis in his constitution. By great attention to diet, to exercise, and to early hours, he gradually gained strength without any relapse, or material check; and his health became progressively confirmed. At the age of eighteen he was a healthy man; and he continued so for many years. The preservation of Mr. Pitt's life, in its early part, may be considered as owing, under Providence, to his own care and the affectionate watchfulness of his friends; and the premature decline of his health, long before he reached the ordinary age of man, may as justly be ascribed to the anxiety and fatigue of unremitted attention to the duties of his public station.

"It was originally intended, that Mr. Pitt should take the degree of bachelor of arts in the regular way, and be candidate for academical honours; but his inability to keep the necessary terms, in consequence of the illness which has been noticed, caused this intention to be abandoned; and in the spring of 1776 he was admitted to the degree of master of arts, to which his birth gave him a right, and which is usually conferred upon young men of a certain rank, after about two years' residence in the university, without any public examination, or the performance of any public exercise, and, of course without the power of giving public proof of their talents or attainments.

"While Mr. Pitt was under-graduate, he never omitted attending chapel morning and evening, or dining in the public hall, except when prevented by indisposition. Nor did he pass a single evening out of the college walls. Indeed, most of his time was spent with me; and exclusively of the satisfaction I had in superintending the education of

a young man of his uncommon abilities and thirst for improvement, his sweetness of temper and vivacity of disposition endeared him to me in a degree which I should in vain attempt to express.

"Towards the latter end of the year 1776, Mr. Pitt began to mix with other young men of his own age and station in life; then resident at Cambridge; and no one was ever more admired and beloved by his acquaintance and friends. He was always the most lively person in company, abounding in playful wit and quick repartee; but never known to excite pain, or to give just ground of offence. Even those, who, from difference in political sentiments, or from any other cause, were not disposed to do him more than justice, could not but allow, that as a companion he was unrivalled. Though his society was universally sought, and from the age of seventeen or eighteen he constantly passed his evenings in company, he steadily avoided every species of irregularity; and he continued to pursue his studies with ardent zeal and unremitting diligence, during his whole residence in the university, which was protracted to the unusual length of nearly seven years, but with considerable intervals of absence. In the course of this time, I never knew him spend an idle day; nor did he ever fail to attend me at the appointed hour. At this early period there was the same firmness of principle, and rectitude of conduct, which marked his character in the more advanced stages of life.

"It was my general rule to read with Mr. Pitt alternately, classics and mathematics; occasionally intermixing other branches of learning. He proceeded with a rapidity which can scarcely be conceived; and his memory was retentive in a degree of which I have known but few examples, although it had not been strengthened by the practice of repetition, so properly in use at public schools, but often omitted in private education. A tutor is generally satisfied, if he can give his pupil some knowledge of an author, by selecting for his perusal certain parts of his works; but there was scarcely a Latin or a Greek classical writer of eminence, the whole of whose works Mr. Pitt and I did not read together. He was a nice observer of their different styles, and alive to all their various and characteristic excellencies. The quickness of his comprehension did not prevent close and minute application. When alone, he dwelt for hours upon striking passages of an orator or historian, in noticing their turn of expression, in marking their manner of arranging a narrative, or explaining the avowed or secret motives of action. A few pages sometimes occupied a whole morning. It was a favourite employment with him, to compare opposite speeches upon the same subject; and to examine how each speaker managed his own side of the question, and obviated or answered the reasoning of his opponent. This may properly be called study, peculiarly useful to a future lawyer or statesman. The authors whom he preferred for this purpose, were Livy, Thucydides, and Sallust. Upon these occasions his observations were not unfrequently committed to paper, and furnished a topic for conversation with me at our next meeting. He was also in the habit of copying any eloquent sentence, or any beautiful or forcible expression, which occurred in his reading. The poets of Greece and Rome had their full share of

his attention; and he unquestionably derived from them that advantage, as well as amusement, which they are eminently calculated to confer. So anxious was he to be acquainted with every Greek poet, that he read with me, at his own request, the obscure and in general uninteresting work of Lycophron, and with an ease at first sight, which if I had not witnessed it, I should have thought beyond the compass of human intellect. He was not fond of composition, not having been accustomed to it when a boy; nor did he attain that degree of excellence in writing Latin and Greek, which is often acquired by young men educated at our public schools.

"It ought, perhaps, to be mentioned, that Mr. Pitt did not construe classical authors in the ordinary way, but read several sentences of the original, and then gave the translation of them; and the almost intuitive quickness, with which he instantly saw the meaning of the most difficult passages of the most difficult writers, made an impression upon my mind, which no time can efface. He possessed, indeed, this faculty in so extraordinary a degree, and his diligent application to Greek literature had rendered his knowledge of that language so correct and extensive, that I am persuaded, if a play of Menander or Æschylus, or an ode of Pindar, had been suddenly found, he would have understood it as soon as any professed scholar. There unquestionably have been persons who had far greater skill in verbal criticism, and in the laws of metre; but it may, I believe, be said with the strictest truth, that no one ever read the Greek language, even after devoting his whole life to the study of it, with greater facility than Mr. Pitt did at the age of twenty-one.

"He was not less successful in mathematics and natural philosophy; displaying the same acuteness and readiness in acquiring knowledge, with an unexampled skill in applying it to the solution of problems. He was master of every thing usually known by young men who obtain the highest academical honors, and felt a great desire to fathom still further the depths of pure mathematics; and had I thought it right to indulge this inclination, he would have made a wonderful progress in that abstruse science. When the connexion of tutor and pupil was about to cease between us, he expressed a hope, that he should find leisure and opportunity to read Newton's *Principia* again with me after some summer circuit; and in the later periods of his life, he frequently declared that no portion of his time had been more usefully employed than that, which had been devoted to these studies—not merely from the new ideas and actual knowledge which he had thus acquired, but also on account of the improvement which his mind and understanding had received from the habit of close attention and patient investigation. In truth, this is the just and appropriate praise of mathematical pursuits, that they not only convey much important information, but give a strength and accuracy to the intellectual and reasoning powers, which best qualify young men, both for the duties of the liberal professions, and for the business of the higher departments of active life.

"There was scarcely any book in the wide circuit of Mr. Pitt's reading, from which he derived greater advantage and satisfaction,

than from Locke's *Essay on the Human Understanding*, of which he formed a complete and correct analysis. He was a great admirer of this truly excellent work, while he reprobated the author's notions on the origin of civil government, as unfounded and of dangerous tendency. He indicated no inclination, and he certainly had no encouragement from me, to carry his metaphysical studies any farther. He gave great attention to the public lectures in civil law, a subject which he considered as connected with his intended profession; and in the lectures upon experimental philosophy, he had a pleasure in seeing theoretical rules exemplified and confirmed. Amidst these severer studies, the lighter species of literature were by no means omitted; and I ought in particular to mention his intimate acquaintance with the historical and political writers of his own country, and his elegant taste for the beauties of the English poets. To whatever branch of knowledge he applied, or whatever subject he discussed, the superiority of his abilities, and the clearness and comprehensiveness of his mind, were equally manifest. These eminent qualities were in no degree tarnished by pride or self-conceit, which are too often found in young men of distinguished talents. He was gentle and unassuming; and the natural cheerfulness of his temper, and unaffected urbanity of his manners, recommended him to persons of every age and station. Upon any topic which might arise in conversation, the openness of his character led him to express his opinion with a manly decision; but at the same time he always listened with a due regard and respectful attention to the sentiments of others; and such were the candor and mildness of his disposition, that when talking unreservedly with me, he never spoke with harshness or resentment even of those from whom he had received injurious treatment." (Vol. i. p. 2—11.)

We have thought it proper to introduce the above long extract, because it has brought to light those particulars of the life of this illustrious man, the want of which has been long matter of regret. The account published by Mr. Gifford was peculiarly barren of this interesting portion of intelligence; and we should have found no fault with the present right reverend biographer if he had drawn out this part of his history into greater minuteness. Nothing pleases, nothing interests, nothing instructs more than these domestic details of the stages of a glorious life; while a certain caution is necessary in the application we make of such facts, and the inferences we found upon them. What share the particular course of study above described may have had in forming the mind of Mr. Pitt, or in building up the great edifice of his glory, can only be conjectured, though it seems to have been such as could not but have promoted the developement of his surprising faculties. His tutor, probably, rather followed than directed the track of his procedure, waiting upon the natural inquisitiveness of such a mind, which would be sure to suggest

the successive steps by which every inquiry might be made most speedily to unfold its results, and an intellectual hold of every subject be most compendiously obtained.

Among the early studies of Mr. Pitt, the Bible appears to have held an eminent place. We cannot doubt that this was a predilection which his tutor was well disposed to encourage. Besides the foundation of truth which it probably laid in his mind, it is not unlikely that, in such a mind, it fostered a taste for sublime imagery, and noble expression, which entered afterwards most operatively into the composition of his eloquence. Some parts of his general method are pointed out as novelties, which we rather wondered to find so treated in a book written by a scholar. To read several sentences of a Latin or Greek author, and then give the translation of them, seems to us to be the ordinary way with every person who may be considered as a proficient in classical learning. We cannot approve of his being induced to read and analyze Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding, and to make that the beginning and end of his metaphysical studies. We should have considered that a cautious theologian might have seen, in that work, some dogmas to which it might be dangerous, both to reason and religion, to give an unqualified assent; and that the proper limitations to some of Mr. Locke's reasonings might be best learned from the works of some of his able opponents. We know, from the letters published by Lord Grenville of the late Lord Chatham to the father of the late Lord Camelford, that Lord Bolingbroke's works, and Dr. Isaac Barrow's sermons, were favourite models of that great statesman; and, therefore, we are not to wonder that they attracted the admiration of Mr. Pitt: the sermons are full of noble passages; but the writings of Lord Bolingbroke are too diffuse and desultory in composition to furnish an equivalent to the student, if any thing could be an equivalent, for the disturbing and dangerous tendencies of much of the matter they contain. Of Middleton's *Life of Cicero* we cannot but agree in opinion with Mr. Pitt. The style is very pure; and while it is free from all pedantry or parade of expression, it has a manly beauty, and scholar-like elegance, which will entitle it to hold a place among the models sanctioned by Mr. Pitt's adoption.

The letters of the late Lord Chatham, above alluded to, are by no means the vehicles of tasteful observation on the compositions of others; nor are they superior specimens of epistolary writing in themselves. We are, therefore, not surprised to find the letters from that great man, to the subject of these Memoirs, while at College, in no respect better than what an

ordinary man might have written. We will submit one or two of them to our readers. The first was written by Lord Chatham to Mr. Pitt, upon his going to the University, in 1773:

“ ‘ Burton-Pynsent, Oct. 9th, 1773.

“ ‘ Thursday’s post brought us no letter from the dear traveller: We trust this day will prove more satisfactory; it is the happy day that gave us your brother, and will not be less in favour with all here if it should give us, about four o’clock, an epistle from my dear William. By that hour, I reckon, we shall be warm in our cups, and shall not fail to pour forth, with renewed joy, grateful libations over the much wished tidings of your prosperous progress towards your destination. We compute that yesterday brought you to the venerable aspect of alma mater; and that you are invested to-day with the toga virilis. Your race of *manly* virtue, and *useful* knowledge is now begun, and may the favour of Heaven smile upon the noble career!

“ ‘ Little — was really disappointed at not being in time to see you—a good mark for my young, vivid friend. He is just as much compounded of the elements of *air* and *fire* as he was. A due proportion of terrestrial solidity will, I trust, come, and make him perfect. How happy, my loved boy, is it, that your mamma and I can tell ourselves, there is at Cambridge, one without a beard, “and all the elements so mixed in him that nature might stand up, and say, ‘This is a man.’” I now take leave for to-day, not meaning this for what James calls a *regular* letter, but a *dying* thought, that wings itself towards my absent William. Horses are ready, and all is birth-day.

“ ‘ Bradshaw has shone, this auspicious morning, in a very fine speech of congratulation; but I foresee, “his sun sets weeping in the lowly west,” that is, a fatal bowl of punch will, before night, quench this luminary of oratory. Adieu, again, and again, sweet boy; and if you acquire health and strength every time I wish them to you, you will be a second Samson, and, what is more, will, I am sure, keep your hair.

“ ‘ Every good wish attends your kind fellow-traveller and *chumm*; nor will he be forgot in our flowing bowls to-day.’”

“ To this interesting letter, lady Chatham added the following postscript:

“ ‘ If more could be said expressive of feelings, my dearest dear boy, I would add a letter to this epistle, but as it is composed, I will only sign to its expressive contents,

“ ‘ Your fond and loving mother,

“ ‘ HESTER CHATHAM.’ ”

(Vol. i. p. 11, 12.)

The following letter was written from Lord Chatham to Mr. Pitt, when he was recovering from illness. .

“ ‘ Burton Pynsent, Oct. 30, 1773.

“ ‘ With what ease of mind and joy of heart I write to my loved William, since Mr. Wilson’s comfortable letter of Monday! I do not mean to address you as a sick man: I trust in heaven that *convalescent*

is the only title I am to give you in the ailing tribe; and that you are now enjoying the happy-advantage of Dr. Glynn's acquaintance, as one of the cheerful and witty sons of Apollo, in his poetic, not his medical, attribute. But, though I indulge with inexpressible delight, the thought of your returning health, I cannot help being a little in pain, lest you should make *more haste than good speed* to be well. Your mamma has been before me, in suggesting that most useful proverb, *reculer pour mieux sauter*, useful to all, but to the *ardent, necessary*. You may indeed, my sweet boy, better than any one, practise this sage dictum, without any risque of been *thrown out* (as little James would say) in the *chase of learning*. All you want, at present, is *quiet*; with this, if your ardor *αριστευειν* can be kept in, till you are stronger, you will make *noise* enough. How happy the task, my noble amiable boy, to caution you *only against pursuing too much*, all those liberal and praiseworthy things, to which less happy natures are perpetually to be spurred and driven! I will not tease you with too long a lecture in favour of *inaction*, and a competent *stupidity*, your *two best tutors and companions* at present. You have time to spare: consider there is but the *Encyclopedia*; and when you have mastered all that, what will remain? You will want, like Alexander, another world to conquer. Your mamma joins me in every word; and we know how much your affectionate mind can sacrifice to our earnest and tender wishes. Brothers, and sisters are well; all feel about you, think and talk of you, as they ought. My affectionate remembrances go in great abundance to Mr. Wilson. Vive, Vale, is the unceasing prayer of your truly loving father,

CHATHAM."

(Vol. i. p. 13, 14.)

"Hayes, Sept. 2, 1774.

"I write, my dearest William, the post just going out, only to thank you for your most welcome letter, and for the affectionate anxiety you express for my situation, left behind in the hospital, when our flying camp moved to Stowe. Gout has for the present subsided, and seems to intend deferring his favours till winter, if autumn will do its duty, and bless us with a course of steady weather; those days, which Madame de Sevigné so beautifully paints, *des jours fils d'or et de soye*.

"I have the pleasure to tell you, your mother and sisters returned perfectly well from Bucks, warm in praises of magnificent and princely Stowe; and full of due sentiments of the agreeable and kind reception they found there. No less than two dances, in the short time they passed there. One escape from a wasp's nest, which proved only an adventure to talk of, by the incomparable skill and presence of mind of Mr. Cotton, driving our girls in his carriage with four very fine horses and no postillion. They fell into an ambuscade of wasps more fierce than *Pandours*, who beset these coursers of spirit not inferior to *Xanthus and Podarges*, and stung them to madness; when disdaining the master's hand, he turned them short into a hedge, threw some of them, as he meant to do; and leaping down, seized the bridles of the leaders, which afforded time for your sisters to get out safe and sound, their honor, in point of courage, intact, as well as their bones; for they

are celebrated not a little on their composure in this alarming situation. I rejoice that your time passes to your mind, in the evacuated seat of the Muses. However, knowing that those heavenly ladies (unlike the London fair) delight most and spread their choicest charms and treasures in sweet retired solitude, I won't wonder that their true votary is happy to be alone with them. Mr. Prettyman will by no means spoil company, and I wish you joy of his return. How many commons have you lost of late? Whose fences have you broken; and in what lord of the manor's pound have any *strays of science* been found, since the famous adventure of catching the horses with such admirable address and alacrity? I beg my affectionate compliments to Mr. Wilson, and hope you will both beware of an inclosed country for the future. Little James is still with us, doing penance for the *high living* so well described to you in Mrs. Pam's excellent epistle. All loves follow my sweetest boy in more abundance than I have time or ability to express."

"I desire my best compliments to the kind and obliging master who loves Cicero and you." (Vol. i. p. 15—17.)

The letter which follows was written about seven, or eight months before the death of the Earl.

"Hayes, Sept. 22, 1777.

"How can I employ my reviving pen so well as by addressing a few lines to the *hope and comfort* of my life, my dear William? You will have pleasure to see, under my own hand, that I mend every day, and that I am all but well. I have been this morning to Camden-place, and sustained, most manfully, a visit, and all the idle talk thereof, for above an hour by Mr. Norman's clock; and returned home, untired, to dinner, where I eat like a farmer. Lord Mahon has confounded, not convinced, the incorrigible *soi-disant* Dr. Wilson. Dr. Franklin's lightning, rebel as he is, stands proved the more innocent; and Wilson's nobs must yield to the pointed conductors. On Friday, lord Mahon's indefatigable spirit is to exhibit another incendium, to lord mayor, foreign ministers, and all lovers of philosophy and the good of society; and means to illuminate the horizon with a little bonfire of twelve hundred faggots and a double edifice. Had our dear friend been born sooner, Nero and the second Charles could never have amused themselves by reducing to ashes the two noblest cities in the world. My hand begins to demand repose;—so, with my best compliments to Aristotle, Homer, Thucydides, Xenophon, not forgetting the civilians, and law of nations tribe, adieu, my dearest William.

"Your ever most affectionate father,

"CHATHAM."

(Vol. i. p. 17, 18.)

Mr. Pitt began to reside in Lincoln's Inn, and to attend Westminster Hall, in the spring of 1780, about two years after his father's death; having lost, in the mean time, his sister, the Viscountess Mahon, and a younger brother, Mr. James Pitt, a post captain in the navy, on the death of the latter of whom he

wrote a very feeling letter to the author of these Memoirs, which he has given to the public. At the general election, in the autumn of 1780, he was an unsuccessful candidate for Cambridge University; and in January following he was chosen for the borough of Appleby, in Westmoreland.

The occasion of Mr. Pitt's first speech in Parliament, and the circumstances attending it, are thus related in these Memoirs:

"On the 26th of February, a circumstance of a very remarkable nature occasioned Mr. Pitt to make his first speech in the house of commons. The subject of debate was, Mr. Burke's bill for economical reform in the civil list. Lord Nugent was speaking against the bill; and Mr. Byng, member for Middlesex, knowing Mr. Pitt's sentiments upon the measure, asked him to reply to his lordship. Mr. Pitt gave a doubtful answer; but in the course of lord Nugent's speech, he determined not to reply to him. Mr. Byng, however, understood that Mr. Pitt intended to speak after lord Nugent; and the moment his lordship sat down, Mr. Byng and several of his friends, to whom he had communicated Mr. Pitt's supposed intention, called out, in the manner usual in the house of commons, Mr. Pitt's name as being about to speak. This probably prevented any other person from rising; and Mr. Pitt, finding himself thus called upon, and observing that the house waited to hear him, thought it necessary to rise. Though really not intending to speak, he was from the beginning collected and unembarrassed; he argued strongly in favour of the bill, and noticed all the objections which had been urged by the noble lord who immediately preceded him in the debate, in a manner which greatly astonished all who heard him. Never were higher expectations formed of any person upon his first coming into parliament, and never were expectations more completely answered. They were indeed much more than answered: such were the fluency and accuracy of language, such the perspicuity of arrangement, and such the closeness of reasoning, and manly and dignified elocution—generally, even in a much less degree, the fruits of long habit and experience—that it could scarcely be believed to be the first speech of a young man not yet two-and-twenty.

On the following day, Mr. Pitt, knowing my anxiety upon every subject which related to him, with his accustomed kindness, wrote to me at Cambridge, to inform me, that 'he had heard his own voice in the house of commons;' and modestly expressed his satisfaction at the manner in which his first attempt at parliamentary speaking had been received." (Vol. i. p. 22, 23.)

Mr. Pitt having now fairly entered on his political life, the Bishop presents us with the regular series of his orations in the House of Commons, in aid of the prevailing efforts which were then making to effectuate the overthrow of the declining power of Lord North. The three speeches which were delivered by him in the first session in which he sat, and

which ended on the 18th of July, 1781, established his character as an orator, insomuch, that the Bishop tells us that a friend of Mr. Fox informed him that, upon his saying to Mr. Fox, "Mr. Pitt, I think, promises to be one of the first speakers ever heard in the House of Commons," Mr. Fox instantly replied, "He is so already." In the mean time, Mr. Pitt continued an attendant on the courts, and at the circuits; but his opportunities of displaying his talents for the bar were few, and of no magnitude. During his short continuance in the profession, he never had an opportunity of addressing a jury; but it seems that in some bribery causes from Cricklade, in which he was junior counsel, he argued a point of evidence with great ability; and as junior counsel also, in an adultery cause at Exeter, he displayed such talents in cross-examination, that it was the opinion of the bar, he should have led the cause. And in one of those mock debates, *umbratiles exercitationes*, which are resorted to by young men intending themselves for the profession of the bar, Mr. Pitt, it appears, gave prognostics of his future eminence as a speaker. It is very questionable, however, whether, had he followed up the profession of a barrister, he would have risen to excellence. Those who have been most distinguished as advocates have often made but a small figure in parliamentary debates; and this is enough to invalidate the inference that a powerful orator in the senate must necessarily have risen to great distinction at the bar, had the chances of life determined him to that course. The reasons for this disparity of attainment, in situations between which there is so much affinity, are doubtless very various and minute, and some are probably very deep and latent in the constitution of the mind; but some important differences readily occur: the barrister addresses a small auditory, upon prescribed topics, with the facts supplied to him,—the senator addresses the collective mind of the country, has to choose his topics, and collect his facts,—and, which is a difference most important in its effect upon the mental and physical economy of the speaker, the advocate *must* be heard,—the parliamentary orator can only command attention by deserving it. On the other hand, the narrowness of technical range, the singleness of purpose, and closeness of detail, requisite as well in the conduct of a cause at Nisi Prius, as in the exposition and maintenance of the points arising out of it, before the judges, may easily be supposed wanting in him who possesses all the requisites for a diffusive parliamentary debater.

In the ensuing session of Parliament, Mr. Pitt entered upon a course of grand and spirited declamation against the conti-

nuance of the American war. A succession of resolutions were moved day after day, involving, under various forms, the condemnation of the ministers, on the conduct and continuance of the American war; till at length, on the 15th of March, 1782, the house dividing upon the question, the numbers were, 236 for ministers, and 227 against them; and, on the Wednesday following, Lord North, in his place, announced the resignation of himself and his colleagues. It must be admitted that this unfortunate administration was sinking under the assaults of Mr. Fox and his political associates; but the prominent part acted by Mr. Pitt during the last twelve months of its existence, strikes us with the greatest surprise, when we reflect that he had not yet attained the twenty-third year of his age.

During the few months which the administration lasted, of which the Marquis of Rockingham was the head, being first Lord of the Treasury, while Lord Shelburne and Mr. Fox were the two Secretaries of State, Mr. Pitt, continued attached to his profession of the law, declining several offers of lucrative posts, being avowedly determined to belong to no administration of which he did not form a part. It was at this time that he became connected with the associations formed for the purpose of obtaining what was called a Reform in Parliament, and was selected as the properest person to bring forward this question in the House of Commons. The fate of this motion is well known, as well as of that of Alderman Sawbridge, who moved on the 17th of May, in the same year, to bring in a bill for shortening the duration of parliaments, which had the support of both Mr. Pitt and Mr. Fox. Mr. Pitt's succeeding efforts in favour of this measure were certainly not characterized by much appearance of zeal; and we find him, at the beginning of the French Revolution, if not abandoning it altogether, at least decidedly opposing it, on the ground of the great danger of unsettling the constitution, and opening it to any material changes, at a period in which so much public agitation prevailed, and when the peace of every empire was threatened by revolutionary principles and a boundless thirst of innovation. This is perhaps the only instance of a substantial change in Mr. Pitt's opinions during the course of his political life, and it has been made a frequent ground for the charge of inconsistency. But the charge is altogether vain and ridiculous. It is, besides, assuming the fact in opposition to his own statements.

His great and explicit declaration on the subject was made in the year 1792, in the spring of which year that most detestable association was formed, calling itself the "Friends of

the People," consisting of 100 persons, twenty-eight of whom were active members of the House of Commons, in opposition to government, with the exception of Mr. Fox, and most of whom, as the Bishop of Winchester observes, were avowed admirers of the French Revolution. It was in consequence of a resolution entered into at this association, that Mr. Grey, on the 30th of April, 1792, gave notice of his intended motion for a reform in the representation. Mr. Pitt rose immediately after Mr. Grey, and said "he believed it was not strictly regular to enter into any observations upon a mere notice of a motion, and, therefore, he was under the correction of the chair whether he should articulate a syllable.

"Go on! go on!" was echoed and re-echoed from all the different parts of the house. He then proceeded;—"If ever there was an occasion, on which the mind of every man, who had any feeling for the present, or hope for the future happiness of this country, should be interested, the present is the time for its exertion. The present is the time, in which the whole house should lose sight of form in the regulation of debate, and apply at once to the substance of the subject which has been mentioned. Nothing can be said, nothing can be whispered upon this subject, at this time, which does not involve questions, of the most extensive, the most serious, the most lasting importance to the people of this kingdom—to the very being of the state. I have other motives, I confess, besides the general importance of the subject, to say a few words now upon it. It is a question, upon which I have thought attentively. I am unwilling to weary the house with many observations upon my own conduct, or upon what seems not exactly to correspond with what I professed in the earliest part of my public character, because I am convinced, that the question to be brought forward, will involve something more than the character, the fortune, the connexion, the liberty, or the life of any individual. It may affect the peace and tranquillity which, under the favour of Providence, this country has long enjoyed, in a superior degree, perhaps, to any part of the habitable globe. It may affect us, who, from the time of general darkness and bondage, to the present hour, have sat quietly, perceiving other powers struggling with tyranny and oppression, while we enjoyed our freedom; it may bring us into anarchy and confusion, worse, if possible, than if we had to contend with despotism itself.

"I think, that the country should know, what the opinions of public men are, upon the subject now before us, and how they feel at this moment. I confess they have a peculiar right to know from me, my opinion relative to parliamentary reform. I could have wished, that a subject of this immense importance had been brought forward at a time, when I was personally more able to take an active part in a debate than at present, but above all on a day, on which the house had no other matter to attend to. I wish also, the honorable gentleman would bring it forward in some distinct proposition."

to the house, that they might, early in the next session of parliament, take the whole question into consideration; in which case, I should, perhaps, have reserved myself until the day appointed, for the consideration of the subject; but as this is a general notice, without any specific proposition, I must say, I feel no difficulty in declaring, in the most decisive terms, that I object both to the time and to the mode, in which this business is brought forward. I feel this subject so deeply, that I must speak upon it without any reserve. I will therefore confess, that, in one respect, my opinion upon this subject is changed, and I am not ashamed to own it. I retain my opinion of the propriety of a reform in parliament, if it could be obtained without mischief or danger, by a general concurrence, pointing harmlessly at its object. But, I confess, I am afraid at this moment, that if agreed to by this house, the security of all the blessings we enjoy, will be shaken to the foundation. I confess I am not sanguine enough to hope, that a reform at this time can safely be attempted. My object always has been, and now is most particularly so, to give permanence to that which we actually enjoy, rather than to remove any actually subsisting grievances. I conceive that the only security for the continuance of the beautiful system of our constitution, is in the house of commons; but I am sorry to confess, that this security is imperfect, while there are persons who think, that the people are inadequately represented in the degree now asserted. It is essential to the happiness of the people, that they should be convinced, that they and the members of this house feel an identity of interests; that the nation at large, and the representatives of the people, hold a general conformity of sentiment: this is the essence of a proper representative assembly; under this legitimate authority, a people may be said to be really free; and this is a state, in which the true spirit of proper democracy may be said to subsist. This is the only mode by which freedom and due order can be well united. If attempts be made to go beyond this, they will end in a wild state of nature, which mocks the name of liberty, and by which the human character is degraded, instead of being exalted. I once thought, and still think, upon the point of representation of the commons, that if some mode could be adopted, by which the people might have any additional security for a continuance of the blessings which they now enjoy, it would be an improvement in the constitution of this country. That is the extent of my object: farther I never wished to go; and if this could be obtained without the risk of losing what we have, I should think it wise to make the experiment. When I say this, it is not because I believe there is any existing grievance in the country, felt at this hour. On the contrary, I believe, that at this hour, we enjoy as much liberty as a rational man ought to wish for; and that we are in a state of prosperity and progressive improvement, seldom equalled, never excelled, by any nation at any period in the history of the world.

"I now come to the time and mode of bringing this subject forward. Upon these points every rational man has two things to consider. These are, the probability of success, and the risk to be

run by ~~the~~ attempt.' Upon the latter consideration, I own that my apprehensions are very great: I fear the evils which may follow the attempt; and, looking at it in both views, I see nothing but discouragement. I see no chance of succeeding in the attempt, in the first place; but, I see great danger of anarchy and confusion in the second. It is true I have made some attempts upon this subject myself; but at what time? What were the circumstances in which I did so? There was then a general apprehension, which now, thank God, is referred to rather as a matter of history, than any thing else—all fear of danger is entirely removed—but there was then a general feeling, that we were upon the verge of a public national bankruptcy, and a strong sense was entertained of practical grievances: this was at the end of the American war, succeeding a period, when the influence of the crown was declared to have increased, to be increasing, and that it ought to be diminished. Many thought, and I was of the number, that, unless there was a better connection between the parliament and the people, and an uniformity of sentiment between them, the safety of the country was endangered. Many moderate men, however, there were at that time, who admitted there were abuses, which ought to be corrected; but who, having weighed the whole state of the case, even as it stood then, were of opinion, that, although some evil was to be met with, yet that, ~~on~~ ^{of} ~~the~~ ^{prop} ~~good~~ ^{of state} preponderated; and, therefore, from a fear of ~~the~~ ^{of state} ~~consequences~~ ^{refuse}, they voted against my plan of reformation. ~~at~~ ^{such} a time, and under such circumstances, moderate men thought in this way, what would they think under the present circumstances? I put it, not only to this house, but also to the country at large; and I would ask all moderate men in it, what are their feelings on this subject at this moment? I believe, that I can anticipate the answer.—'This is not a time to make hazardous experiments.' Can we forget what lessons have been given to the world, within a few years? Can we lament the present situation of this kingdom, when contrasted with that of others? Can we expect that these moderate men will become converts to the new system adopted in another country? If not, there can be no hope of success, and consequently no wisdom in the attempt.'

"But it seems that there is a great number of persons in this country, who wish for a reform in parliament, and that they are increasing daily. That their number is great, I am happy enough to doubt: what their interest or their vigour will be, if called upon to exert themselves against the good sense and courage of the sober part of the community, does not occasion me much apprehension. I do not mean to allude to the sentiments of any particular members of this house, for the purpose of reflecting upon them with ~~an~~ ^{of his} ~~an~~ ^{self}; but when they come in the shape of advertisements in newspapers to the public, as it were, to repair to their standard; and to ~~join~~ ^{ex-} ~~in~~ ^{posed} ~~they~~ ^{to} ~~should~~ ^{be} ~~be~~ ^{reprobated}, and the tendency of their ~~measures~~ ^{ex-} ~~exposed~~ ^{posed} to the people in its true colors. I am willing, as long as I can, to put the best construction upon the actions of gentlemen they will admit of, and to give them credit for their intentions; but the ~~over-~~

tisements I allude to in the newspapers, are sanctioned with the name of the honorable gentleman who has given this notice; and therefore I will say, that there ought to be great activity on the part of the real friends of the constitution, who should take pains properly to address the public mind, and to keep it in that state which is necessary for the preservation of our present tranquillity. I have seen, with concern, that those gentlemen, of whom I speak, members of this house, are associated with others, who not only profess reform, but unequivocally avow revolutionary principles, and applaud and circulate publications of the most pernicious tendency. This circumstance affords suspicion, that the motion for reform is nothing more than the preliminary to the overthrow of the whole system of our present government. If they succeed, they will destroy the best constitution that was ever formed upon the habitable globe. These considerations lead me to wish the house to take great care, that no encouragement be given to any step, which may sap the very foundation of that constitution. When I see these opinions published, and know them to be connected with principles inconsistent with the form of our government—the hereditary succession to the throne—the hereditary titles of our men of rank—and leading to the total destruction of all subordination in the state, I confess I feel no inclination to promise my support to the proposed motion for a parliamentary reform. It would be to follow a madness, which has been called liberty in another country—a condition at war with true freedom and good order—a state to which despotism itself is preferable—a state in which liberty cannot exist for a day: if it appears in the morning, it must perish before sun-set.

“ I beg leave to assure the house, that I think it my duty, to the last hour of my life, to oppose, to the utmost of my power, all projects of this nature. So much do I disapprove the present attempt, that if I were called to choose, either to hazard this, or for ever abandon all hope or desire to have any reform at all, I should say, that I would have no reform whatever; and I believe, that as a member of parliament, as an Englishman, as an honest man, I discharge my duty in making that declaration at once. I wish the honorable gentleman to reflect seriously on his character, and the stake he possesses in this country; and to consider, how much may be lost by an indiscreet attempt upon this subject.

“ I have now made a sort of compendium of the objections I shall submit to the house and the public, if the motion should ever be made; and I have only to add my earnest prayer for the security and preservation of the constitution of this country—a monument of human wisdom in which has hitherto been the exclusive blessing of the human race.” (Vol. ii. p. 455-462.)

ed, and above speech it seems that Mr. Pitt considered that motion to which he had given his early support, had subsequently been carried far beyond his own original views; that what he had contemplated had entirely changed its spirit and character, having become mixed with French revolutionary

madness; that what was true in the abstract, had become dangerous in application; and that under its name and pretence a multitude of mischievous objects had concealed themselves. We cannot, however, help suspecting that although any of these reasons might have justified a change of policy in Mr. Pitt, a change of sentiment had really taken place in his mind, as those objects, which, at a greater distance, had cheated his fancy, were brought within his immediate perception and actual contact; that what had seemed to the speculative ardour of youth to be deformities and anomalies, had proved themselves, to the wiser eye of experience, to be the buttresses and supports of the edifice; and, that a more practical acquaintance with the interior of the constitution, had shown that those irregularities which seemed to disfigure it, had arisen out of a principle of adjustment to the wants, infirmities, and exigencies of human condition. It would, indeed, be a rigid criterion of consistency, were it required to evince itself by a correspondence of sentiment between the ages of twenty-three and forty-five; and were the senator of a twelvemonth old expected to carry with him, through all the subsequent stages of his accumulating observation, one unvarying opinion on the most complex and experimental of all subjects. It is that subject on which wise men are more often found to change their opinion than any other in political science. To the vulgar the hope of change is always seducing; they are always unable to separate adventitious and remediable evils from those which are a necessary part of man's allotment: the mischievous and ambitious find the illusion well calculated to answer their personal ends; the young and sanguine politician, misled perhaps by the very magnanimity of his character, adopts the beautiful error; but as experience guides him to a better knowledge and safer tests, he estimates more wisely the things that are, and discerns more clearly the danger of untried speculations. He perceives that there is no model in our history for the proposed changes; that what is most excellent has been least the result of contrivance; that what might be easily undone, might be impossible to be restored; that in truth, and in fact, parliament has never been better composed; that, composed as it is, it acts efficaciously; that it is the epitome of the nation, comprising a more substantial and diffusive representation of the mind of the country, than if it were wholly of poor materials; and, in fine, that it is the variegated pattern of self-various nature, various habits, various faculties, exhibiting the colours of the human character in its mosaic of bright embroidery.

The death of Lord Rockingham, and the consequent change

of administration, produced a remarkable era in Mr. Pitt's life. Lord Shelburne was appointed First Lord of the Treasury, and Mr. Fox and Lord John Cavendish immediately resigned their offices, a step in perfect consistency with Mr. Fox's maxim of governing himself, in his political conduct, with a regard rather to men than measures; it being considered that the whigs were an indivisible body, of which the Duke of Portland, on the demise of Lord Rockingham, was the ostensible head. Under Lord Shelburne's short-lived administration, Mr. Pitt, at the age of twenty-three, or little more, was Chancellor of the Exchequer. From this moment the great career of Mr. Pitt begun, and Lincoln's-Inn was exchanged for Downing-street. We have now an account of a visit of Mr. Pitt to Mr. Fox, to propose his return to office, and his refusal to join any administration of which Lord Shelburne was the head; and from that period we may date the political hostility of these two remarkable men. The memorable coalition between Mr. Fox and Lord North is the next great event which affected Mr. Pitt's political condition. Mr. Fox had, indeed, a difficult task in defending this ill-omened measure against his adversaries in the house, but principally against himself and his own former exasperated philippics. The whole strength of his ingenuity and resources were demanded for this occasion, and all his ingenuity and resources were exhibited. Finer instances of large and affecting eloquence the powers of man have been unable to produce. We shall here repeat what we have said before, that in the use of that morality which Socrates brought down from Heaven, and infused into the familiarities of domestic intercourse, in the art of addressing the common feelings, and appealing to the duties of ordinary humanity, warm, as it were, from the fire side, Mr. Fox was a great proficient. His characteristic was that of speaking *ῥηδινως*, with a language, feeling, and imagery, accessible to all. Over these topics and their dialect he threw the splendid investiture of his classic genius; it was in this field that he moved with a masculine and gigantic ease, and developed the matchless graces of his vigorous understanding. Yet after having, in a speech delivered at the beginning of the year 1775, declared that "if his private resentments had influenced his public conduct, he might have charged much Noble Lord with the most unexampled treachery and in a pod;" words repeated by him after being called to order, and after having in a subsequent debate on the 22d of June, 1777, avowed that "it was impossible for him to state in any phrase that language could admit of, the shock he felt when a Noble Lord ventured to suggest an alliance with the ministers who had betrayed their country;" after having in his speech on

the distribution of the loan on the 26th of March, 1781, accused the minister of having "prostituted the power of his office to the most abandoned, wicked, and dishonest purposes." And in a few months afterwards, November 27, 1781, expressed his trust that the ministers would hear of their ruinous measures at the tribunal of justice, and expiate them on the public scaffold; "lastly, after having, on a motion for peace with America on the 25th of March, 1782, desired it might be understood that "he did not mean to have any connection with the ministers; that from the moment when he should make any terms with them he would rest satisfied to be called the most infamous of mankind; that he could not for an instant think of a coalition with men, who in every public and private transaction, as ministers, had shown themselves void of any principle of honour and honesty; that in the hands of such men he would not trust his honour even for a minute;" it is not very easy to digest the coalition that did afterwards take place, or to find its apology in the necessity to which the Whigs were driven, of agglomerating all the fragments of power which they had helped to scatter, in order to make head against a single youth not yet twenty-four years of age, a novice in his own profession, and with nothing to help him but his "robe and his integrity." Mr. Pitt's defensive speech, on the first attack of this formidable coalition, is thus in substance recorded by Bishop Tomline.

"Mr. Pitt began his reply, by noticing the unbecoming language of triumph used by Mr. Fox on that day, and by assuring the house, that no party motives should ever seduce him to any inconsistency, which the busiest suspicion should presume to glance at. He would never engage in political enmities without a public cause—he would never forego such enmities without the public approbation—nor would he be questioned and cast off in the face of that house, by one virtuous and dissatisfied friend. These the sober and durable triumphs of reason over the weak and profligate inconsistencies of party violence, these the steady triumphs of virtue over success itself, should not only be his in his present situation, but through every future condition of his life; triumphs, which no length of time should diminish, which no change of principles should ever sully.

"He then detailed at great length the situation of this country with respect to its army, its navy, and its finances; and on the other hand stated the military and naval strength of our numerous enemies, with an allusion to Mr. Fox's humiliating and unsuccessful proposal to Holland on the subject of peace, when he was secretary of state. In speaking of the deficiency of our revenue, he exclaimed, "In self-defence to Mr. Fox's assertion, that other nations were in equilibrium, he said, 'Good God! to what consequences does the honorable gentleman lead us? Should I have ventured to advise the continuance of war, at the risque of a public bankruptcy, which would almost have dissolved the

bonds of government, and have involved the state in the confusion of a general ruin? Should I have ventured to do this, because one of the adverse powers might have experienced the same calamity? He also inquired into the terms of the different treaties, and enumerated what had been respectively ceded, and what retained, by the contracting parties, in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America: from these considerations he drew two conclusions—that it was impossible for this kingdom to have continued the war; and that the peace, all circumstances taken into account, was such as called for the approbation of parliament. There was indeed, he said, a time, when Great Britain might have met her enemies on other conditions; and if an imagination, warmed with the power and glory of this country, could have diverted any member of his Majesty's councils from a painful inspection of the truth, he might, he hoped, without presumption, have been entitled to that indulgence. He felt at that instant, how much he had been animated in his childhood by a recital of England's victories. He was taught by one, whose memory he should ever revere, that at the close of a war, far different indeed from this, she might have dictated the terms of peace to submissive nations. This, in which he placed something more than a common interest, was the memorable æra of England's glory. But that æra was past: she was now under the awful and mortifying necessity of employing a language corresponding with her new condition. The visions of her power and pre-eminence were passed away.

“ ‘These,’ continued Mr. Pitt, ‘are the conditions, to which this country, engaged with four powerful states, and exhausted in all her resources, has thought fit to subscribe, for the dissolution of that confederacy, and the immediate enjoyment of peace. Let us look to what is left, with a manly and determined courage. Let us strengthen ourselves against inveterate enemies, and re-conciliate our antient friends. The misfortunes of kingdoms, as well as of individuals, which are laid open and examined with true wisdom, are more than half redressed; and to this great object should be directed all the virtue and all the abilities of this house.—Let us feel our calamities: let us bear them like men.

“ ‘But, I fear, I have too long engaged your attention to no real purpose, and that the national security will this day be risked, without a blush, by the malice and disappointment of faction. The honorable gentleman (Mr. Fox) has, in fact, declared, that because he was prevented from prosecuting the noble lord in the blue ribbon, to the satisfaction of public justice, he will heartily embrace him as his friend. So readily does he reconcile extremes, and love the man whom he is ready to impeach—with the same spirit, I suppose, he will cherish much peace, because he abhors it. But I will not hesitate to assert, in a of the evident complexion of this night's debate, that the opposition, to the treaties originates, rather in a desire to force the early withdrawal of the money from the treasury, than in any real conviction, that ministers deserve censure for the concessions they have made: concessions, which, from the facts I have enumerated, and the reasoning I have employed as arising from those facts, are the obvious result of

an absolute necessity, and imputable not so much to those of whom the present cabinet is composed, as to that cabinet of which the noble lord in the blue ribbon was a member.'

"In adverting to the supposed coalition between lord North and Mr. Fox, he said, 'If, however, the baneful alliance is not already formed, if this ill-omened marriage is not already solemnized, I know a just and lawful impediment, and in the name of the public safety, I here forbid the banns.'

"After vindicating lord Shelburne from the aspersions of those, who 'thought his elevation effected at their own expence,' and bearing honorable testimony to his abilities and zeal in the service of his country, he proceeded in this manner, 'My own share in the censure, pointed, by the motion before the house, against his Majesty's ministers, I will bear with fortitude, because my heart tells me, I have not acted wrongly. To this monitor, who never did, and I trust never will, deceive me, I will confidently repair, as to an adequate asylum from all the clamor, which interested faction can raise. I was not very eager to come into office, and shall have no great reluctance to go out, whenever I shall be dismissed from the service of the public. It has been the grand object of my short official existence, to do the duties of my station with all the ability and address in my power, and with a fidelity and honor, which should bear me up, and give me confidence, under every possible contingency and disappointment. I can say with sincerity, I never had a wish, which did not terminate in the dearest interests of the nation. I will, at the same time, imitate the honorable gentleman's candor, and confess, that I too have my ambition. High situations and great influence are desirable objects to most men; and objects which I am not ashamed to pursue, which I am even solicitous to possess, whenever they can be acquired with honor and retained with dignity. On these respectable conditions, I am not less ambitious to be great and powerful, than it is natural for a young man to be with such brilliant examples before him. But even these objects I can cheerfully relinquish, the moment my duty to my country, my character, my friends, render such a sacrifice indispensable. Then I hope to retire, not disappointed, but triumphant; triumphant in the conviction, that my talents, humble as they are, have been earnestly, zealously, and strenuously employed, to the best of my apprehension, in promoting the truest welfare of my country; and that, however I may stand chargeable with weakness of understanding, or error of judgment, nothing can be imputed to my official capacity, which bears the most distant connexion with an interested, a corrupt, or a dishonest intention. Nor is it any part of my plan, whenever I may quit my present station, to follow the noble earl, now at the head of his Majesty's councils, to such a postress, as the honorable gentleman promised to rear, for those of his friends, who should find themselves duped as he had been. The self-created and self-appointed successors to the present administration, have asserted with much confidence, that this is likely to be the case. I can assure them, however, that, when they come from that side of the house to this, I will, for one, most readily and cordially accept the

exchange. The only desire I would indulge and cherish on the subject, is, that the service of the public may be ably, disinterestedly, and faithfully performed. To those who feel for their country as I wish to do, and will strive to do, it matters little, who are out, or who are in; but it matters much, that her affairs be conducted with wisdom, with firmness, with dignity, and with credit. Those entrusted to my care I will resign, let me hope, into hands much better qualified to do them justice than mine. But I will not mimic the parade of the honorable gentleman, in avowing, and inviting others to, an indiscriminate opposition to whoever may be appointed to succeed. I will march out with no warlike, no hostile, no menacing protestations; but hoping that the new administration will have no other object in view than the real and substantial welfare of the community at large; that they will bring with them into office those public and patriotic principles, which some of them formerly held, but which they abandoned in opposition; that they will save the state, and promote the great purposes of public good, with as much steadiness, integrity, and solid advantage, as I am confident it must one day appear, the earl of Shelburne and his colleagues have done, I promise them beforehand, my uniform and best support on every occasion, where I can honestly and conscientiously assist them.*

"In short, sir, what appears dishonorable or inadequate in the peace on your table, is strictly chargeable to the noble lord in the blue ribbon, whose profusion of the public money, whose notorious temerity and obstinacy in prosecuting the war, which originated in his pernicious and oppressive policy, and whose utter incapacity to fill the station he occupied, rendered peace of any description indispensable to the preservation of the state. The small part which fell to my lot in this ignominious transaction, as it is called, was divided with a set of men, whom the dispassionate public must, on reflection, unite to honor. Unused as I am to the factious and jarring clamors of this day's debate, I look up to the independent part of the house, and to the public at large, if not for that impartial approbation which my conduct deserves, at least for that acquittal from blame, to which my innocence entitles me. I have ever been most anxious to do my utmost for the interest of my country; it has been my sole concern to act an honest and upright part; and I am disposed to think, that every instance of my official deportment will bear a fair and honorable construction. With these intentions I ventured forward on the public notice; and can appeal with some degree of confidence to both sides of the house, for the consistency of my political conduct. My earliest impressions were in favor of the noblest and most disinterested modes of serving the public: these impressions are still dear to my heart; I will cherish them as a legacy infinitely more valuable than the greatest inheritance. On these principles alone I came into parliament and into place; and I now take the whole house to witness, that I have not been under the necessity of contradicting one public declaration I have ever made. I am, notwithstanding, at the disposal of this house, and with their decision, whatever it shall be, I will cheerfully comply. It is impossible to deprive me of those feelings,

which must always result from the sincerity of my best endeavours to fulfil with integrity every official engagement. You may take from me, sir, the privileges and emoluments of place; but you cannot, and you shall not, take from me those habitual and warm regards for the prosperity of Great Britain, which constitute the honor, the happiness, the pride of my life; and which, I trust, death alone can extinguish. And with this consolation, the loss of power, sir, and the loss of fortune, though I affect not to despise, I hope I shall soon be able to forget.

Laudo manentem; si celeres quatit

Pennas, resigno quæ dedit—

probamque,

Patieriem sine dote quæro." (Vol. i. p. 90—97.)

The coalition phalanx prevailed. Lord Shelburne and Mr. Pitt were out-voted on the motion for censuring the peace; the ministers resigned, and an interval ensued in which the King manifested his great repugnance to place the country in the hands of Mr. Fox and Lord North. In this interval, Mr. Pitt was offered, and refused, the situation of first lord of the Treasury, with full powers to nominate his colleagues. Upon this extraordinary fortune for so young a man, we will offer no comment; but we cannot refrain from laying before our readers the manner of the proposal, and the style of the refusal.

"In consequence of the unsuccessful conclusion of the above negotiation, the king again offered the treasury to Mr. Pitt; and after several times conversing with him upon the subject, at a late hour on Monday the 24th of March, he wrote a letter to him from Windsor, in the most pressing terms, which, after complaints of the treatment he had received from the duke of Portland and lord North, ended with these words, 'I trust, therefore, Mr. Pitt will exert himself to-morrow, to plan his mode of filling up the offices that will be vacant, so as to be able, on Wednesday morning, to accept the situation his character and talents fit him to hold, when I shall be in town before twelve, ready to receive him.' To which Mr. Pitt returned the following answer the next day: 'Mr. Pitt received this morning, the honour of your majesty's gracious commands. With infinite pain he feels himself under the necessity of humbly expressing to your majesty, that with every sentiment of dutiful attachment to your majesty, and zealous desire to contribute to the public service, it is utterly impossible for him, after the fullest consideration of the situation in which things stand, and of what passed yesterday in the house of commons, to think of undertaking, under such circumstances, the situation which your majesty has had the condescension and goodness to propose to him. As what he now presumes to write is the final result of his best reflection, he should think himself criminal, if by delaying till to-morrow, humbly to lay it before your majesty, he should be the cause of your majesty's not immediately turning your royal mind to such a plan of arrangement, as the exigency of the present circumstances

may, in your majesty's wisdom, seem to require." (Vol. i. p. 112, 113.)

The King gave way, and the coalition administration was established, in which Mr. Pitt was invited to accept the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, and declined it. On the 4th of July, 1783, we find Mr. Secretary Fox defending, against the attacks of Mr. Pitt, the increase of the emoluments of the four Tellers of the Exchequer. With regard to the influence of the crown, Mr. Fox observed, "That much as he was an enemy to any undue influence, he was convinced that it was impossible for the government of a great kingdom to go on, unless it had certain lucrative and honourable situations to bestow upon its officers, in a peculiar line, as a provision for their families, and a reward for their eminent and distinguished services. Of this sort were the places in the Exchequer, of which, though it might be necessary to lessen the inordinate emoluments, in *times and seasons*, when they undoubtedly ought not to increase; yet care ought to be taken not to pare them too close, or to lower them so much as to render them unworthy the acceptance or expectations of great and distinguished characters." The period of Mr. Fox being in power did not seem to him to be the time or season for this retrenchment; but it was the time and season for Mr. Pitt to propose his bill for the regulation of public offices, the fate of which was what might have been expected.

In the beginning of September, 1783, Mr. Pitt, in company with Mr. Eliot and Mr. Wilberforce, made a short visit to France; and returning in less than two months, began to think of resuming his profession of the law, in case there should be a prospect of the new administration being permanent. The great business of our India settlements, and Mr. Fox's celebrated measure, soon gave a different turn to his views and exertions. It was now that Mr. Pitt found ample ground for charging upon Mr. Fox the plain avowal of his intention to govern England by a party. It would be unfair, towards the right reverend author of the work before us, not to observe that on every topic which his narrative brings under view, he is very explicit in the statement of his own opinions. His partiality for Mr. Pitt, and all his measures, is avowed; and the reader must travel through his volumes, if he means to proceed with advantage, not without a due caution in receiving his instructions and expositions. In his animadversions, however, on the India Bill of Mr. Fox, his Lordship has ranged himself with the wisest and best men which this country has

The Bishop has thus characterised the measure;

" This plan strongly marked the bold and ambitious character of its author. We have seen, that Mr. Fox admitted the risque he incurred by the proposal; and it was generally believed, that more than one of his friends endeavoured to dissuade him from so hazardous an attempt; but he refused to listen to their advice, being convinced, that the plan, if it succeeded, would probably establish him in office for life; and foreseeing, if it failed, no other bad consequence than the end of his administration, the continuance of which, under present circumstances, he well knew to be extremely precarious. Such appears to have been the ground of Mr. Fox's conduct, in bringing forward a measure, which would have effected a material change in the constitution, by the creation of a new independent power, greater than that of the king. The appointment to all the offices of the company at home, and to the governments and other lucrative situations, of every description, in India; the disposal of the military commands and commissions in the armies of that immense empire; the annual nomination of cadets and writers, to the different settlements; the power of protecting those who returned to England, with fortunes acquired by means which could not bear a strict examination; the purchase of merchandize and stores, to the amount of five or six millions a year; the taking up of ships, and the contracts for freight—these and various other means of favour, and sources of patronage, connected with such numerous establishments, such extensive trade, so large a dominion, and so ample a revenue, must have constituted a degree of influence, which, when opposed to ministers, might have impeded the necessary functions of executive government; and when friendly, might have enabled them to carry any measures, however injurious to the liberties of the people, or to the prerogative of the crown.

" In support of what has been now asserted, relative to the formidable extent of Indian patronage, I must observe, that it is stated in one of the reports of the select committee, which were drawn up by the friends of Mr. Fox, and were appealed to as the ground and justification of this plan, that ' the East India company is in possession of a vast empire, with a boundless patronage, civil, military, marine, commercial, and financial; in every department, of which, such fortunes have been made, as could be made no where else.' Mr. Fox's own authority may also be quoted upon this subject: in April of the preceding year, when he was secretary of state, he said, (in the house of commons,) that ' he could not, consistently with his regard for the constitution of the country, approve the taking away from the East India company; and placing under the direction of the crown, the entire management of our territorial possessions in the East: this would afford to government such ample means of corruption and undue influence, as might, in the end, overthrow the whole constitution, and deprive us of our best and dearest rights; on which account, he thought it would be more prudent to leave to the company the appointment of its own servants.' It should be remembered, that the patronage, from which he then apprehended such mischievous consequences, if placed in the crown, was confined to the territorial possessions of the company; whereas he now proposed to give to the com-

missoiners recommended by himself, not only that patronage, but also the additional appointment to all the offices and employments connected with the trade, and every other concern of the company, both at home and in India. And on the very day he moved for leave to bring in this bill, he said, that the influence of the crown had been diminished: but, added he, 'the influence of the crown, in its most enormous and alarming state, was nothing compared to the boundless patronage of the East India government, if the latter was to be used in the influence of this house.' Could there be a stronger condemnation of the plan, than this acknowledgment by its author? It was impossible for any one to doubt, how patronage would be used, when placed at the command of seven political men, six of whom, as will hereafter be seen, were members of the house of commons, and the seventh a member of the house of lords; all nominated by a person, whose avowed principle it was, as well as that of those with whom he was more immediately connected, that England ought to be governed by a party. This measure was the legitimate offspring of such a principle, operating upon a mind, conscious of possessing neither the favour of the king, nor the confidence of the people, and determined upon acquiring power in defiance of both." (Vol. i. p. 143—146.)

Whatever were the merits or demerits of Mr. Fox's India Bill, it gave occasion to the finest speeches which he ever made in the House of Commons. His existence as a minister, and his character as a man, were at stake. •

On the night of the first of December, 1783, the British House of Commons was a scene of oratorical contention, in which the human understanding seemed to be carried, by great efforts, beyond its natural land-marks. It was then that Mr. Burke made his celebrated oration on the bounds and extent of chartered rights, and that Mr. Fox defended his great and decided measure with a vehemence and splendour unknown to Greek or Roman examples. Such was his velocity, such the urgency of his speed, that the mind sunk exhausted in the effort to accompany his course. "*Tantus enim cursus verborum fuit, et sic evolavit oratio, ut ejus vim et incitationem adspexerim, vestigia ingressumque vix viderim.*" But his efforts, though they drew the House with him, failed in conciliating the public. His Majesty, and the people, saw through and through the measure. It was, indeed, of such transparency, that the bottom was visible to all whom party feeling had not blinded. The Lords rejected the bill; and the Ministers were dismissed. On the 18th of December, 1783, Mr. Pitt was placed at the head of the Treasury, being then only in the twenty-fifth year of his age. The responsibility was inconceivably great; and when Lord Temple, who had advised the King against the measure, in his capacity of Privy Counsellor, resigned the seals as Secretary of State, Mr. Pitt's rest was disturbed, as his biographer states, for the

only time which he had known public business to produce that consequence. Lord Temple's resignation was at a late hour in the evening of the 21st; and when Dr. Prettyman went into his bed-room, the next morning, the new Minister confessed that he had not had a moment's sleep.

Mr. Pitt, by his acceptance of office, was prevented, for some time, from attending the House. In the mean time, Mr. Fox carried every thing by triumphant majorities; and such was the contempt entertained for the power and prospects of the new minister, that, as the Bishop tells us, when the writ for Appleby was moved for, the motion was received by the members of Opposition "with loud and general laughter." During the recess, of the Christmas, which soon after took place, Mr. Pitt had an opportunity of manifesting the greatness of his mind, by an act of disinterestedness, which must have somewhat shaken the faith of his opponents in their own security. The author of the *Memoirs* thus relates this remarkable act of courageous virtue:

"During the recess, the clerkship of the pells, in the gift of the first lord of the treasury, became vacant, by the death of sir Edward Walpole. Mr. Pitt, who had only a small younger brother's fortune, and, to engage in the service of his country, had given up a lucrative and honourable profession, in which his eloquence and talents must have insured him success, could not, perhaps, have been justly censured, if he had availed himself of this opportunity to secure a permanent and adequate income; especially, as his present situation of minister was, in his own judgment, as well as in that of every other person, extremely precarious; and, in any case, its emoluments not defraying its necessary expences, it afforded no prospect of pecuniary compensation: but under existing circumstances, he disdained to convert this event to his own private advantage. He neither accepted the office himself, nor conferred it upon a relation or friend; nor did he dispose of it with a view of increasing his political influence—he gave it to colonel Barré, upon condition of his resigning a pension of 3,000*l.* a year, which was nearly equal to the value of the office; and thus a saving to that amount, was made to the public.

"This act of patriotic disinterestedness excited no surprise in those who knew Mr. Pitt intimately; but upon others, a conduct, so widely different from the practice of former ministers, could not but make a strong impression." (Vol. i. p. 188, 189.)

The protracted contest maintained by Mr. Pitt with his powerful opponents, supported by an overwhelming majority, is exceeded by no instance, which history has to produce, of intellectual daring. The speech of Governor Johnstone, in defence of his conduct, sets it in so true and admirable a light, that we cannot forbear presenting a part of it to our readers.

"In the debate which followed, Governor Johnstone, who was an in-

dependent member, unconnected with Mr. Pitt, after some severe strictures upon Mr. Fox's India bill, observed, 'The confidence of this house is necessary to his majesty's ministers, yet that confidence is neither to be bestowed nor withheld from caprice or partial affection. We have a right to expect his majesty will put his government into the hands of men of ability and integrity. If these requisites are to be found in the king's ministers, and the measures they propose are just and honourable in themselves, it is the height of faction to refuse our assent or support to such men, whatever our connexions may be with others. Respecting the present minister, who will deny his ability, after the appearance he has made in the present discussion? Much less can this come with any weight from his opponents, who are forced, in the speeches they have made in support of the measures to effect his overthrow, without trial or hearing, to acknowledge their admiration of the wonderful talents he has daily displayed. And as to his integrity and public character, is there any person who stands fairer in these respects with the community? Has malice tinged his reputation with any vice or infirmity, or any unbecoming conduct, which can shadow the lustre of the parent, whose station he has taken in this house? If then his majesty has made choice of a minister of the greatest abilities and most spotless integrity, what will the nation at large say of the conduct of this house, who will not even hear his propositions, or try him by his measures, but obstinately adhere to their determination, to force the authors of the East India bill, big with the evils I have described, into his majesty's cabinet; to mortify his private feelings, and deprive his crown of its most valuable prerogatives? It is said indeed, that this conduct is to secure our own existence; but I must, again and again, declare my opinion, that too strenuous an interference of this house to prevent its dissolution, is little short of a bill to continue the duration of parliament; because, if it be admitted, that the house of commons may do wrong, by assuming executive authority, or by taking privileges to themselves, inconsistent with the constitution, there is no remedy left to correct this evil, except a dissolution. History shews, that the tyranny of the many, is worse than the tyranny of the few; and if it be once established, that by repeated addresses, they can perpetuate their existence, no dissolution can take place, and consequently, both the king and the people are left remediless.' (Vol. i. p. 198—200.)

During this memorable struggle, his Majesty was not wanting in what he considered to be his duty towards his faithful and undaunted minister. The royal letters are very interesting proofs of a feeling, perspicacious, and resolute mind. Mr. Pitt, on the first day of his appearing in the House of Commons after his re-election, was left greatly in the minority on several motions; and was assailed, in very reproachful terms, by the leaders of the opposition. Of these occurrences he wrote to the King an account, and received from his Majesty the following answer:

" 'Mr. Pitt cannot but suppose, that I received his communication

of the two divisions in the long debate, which ended this morning, with much uneasiness, as it shews the house of commons to be much more willing to enter into any intemperate resolutions of desperate men, than I could have imagined. As to myself, I am perfectly composed, as I have the self-satisfaction of feeling, I have done my duty. Though I think Mr. Pitt's day will be fully taken up in considering with the other ministers, what measures are best to be proposed on the present crisis; yet that no delay may arise from my absence, I will dine in town, and consequently be ready to see him in the evening, if he should think that would be of utility. At all events, I am ready to take any step that may be proposed to oppose this faction, and to struggle to the last period of my life; but I can never submit to throw myself into its power. If they, in the end, succeed, my line is a clear one, and to which I have fortitude enough to submit." (Vol. i. p. 201, 202.)

The day the address to the King, in support of his prerogatives, was carried in the Lords, on the 4th of February, 1784, his Majesty, in a letter to Mr. Pitt, expressed himself in the following manner :

" " I trust the house of lords will this day feel, that the hour is come, for which the wisdom of our ancestors established that respectable corps in the state, to prevent either the crown or the commons from encroaching on the rights of each other. Indeed, should not the lords stand boldly forth, this constitution should soon be changed; for, if the two only remaining privileges of the crown are infringed, that of negating bills which have passed both houses of parliament, and that of naming the ministers to be employed, I cannot but feel, as far as regards my person, that I can be no longer of utility to this country, nor can with honor continue in this island." (Vol. i. p. 253.)

Mr. Pitt thought it right, at length, to advise his Majesty to propose an interview between the Duke of Portland and himself, for the purpose of endeavouring to form an administration, including themselves and their respective friends: this suggestion was received by the King with considerable surprise and agitation; and the next morning he wrote to Mr. Pitt the following letter, dated February 15th, 1784 :

" " Queen's House, 30 M. past 10 A.M.

" " Mr. Pitt is so well apprised of the mortification I feel at any possibility of ever again seeing the heads of opposition in public employments, and more particularly Mr. Fox, whose conduct has not been more marked against my station in the empire, than against my person, that he must attribute my want of perspicuity in my conversation last night, to that foundation; yet I should imagine it must be an ease to his mind, in conferring with the other confidential ministers this morning, to have on paper my sentiments, which are the result of unremitted consideration, since he left me last night, and which he has my consent to communicate, if he judges it right, to the above respectable persons.

“ ‘ My present situation is perhaps the most singular that ever occurred, either in the annals of this or any other country ; for the house of lords, by a not less majority than near two to one, have declared in my favor ; and my subjects at large, in a much more considerable proportion, are not less decided ; to combat which, opposition have only a majority of twenty, or at most of thirty, in the house of commons, who, I am sorry to add, seem as yet willing to prevent the public supplies. Though I certainly have never much valued popularity, yet I do not think it is to be despised, when arising from a rectitude of conduct, and when it is to be retained by following the same respectable path, which conviction makes me esteem that of duty, as calculated to prevent one branch of the legislature from annihilating the other two, and seizing also the executive power, to which she has no claim.

“ ‘ I confess I have not yet seen the smallest appearance of sincerity in the leaders of opposition, to come into the only mode by which I could tolerate them in my service, their giving up the idea of having the administration in their hands, and coming in as a respectable part of one on a broad basis ; and therefore I, with a jealous eye, look on any words dropped by them, either in parliament, or to the gentlemen of the St. Alban's tavern, as meant only to gain those gentlemen, or, if carrying farther views, to draw Mr. Pitt, by a negotiation, into some difficulty.

“ ‘ Should the ministers, after discussing this, still think it advisable, that an attempt should be made to try, whether an administration can be formed on a real, not a nominal, wide basis, and that Mr. Pitt, having repeatedly, and as fruitlessly, found it impossible to get even an interview on what opposition pretends to admit is a necessary measure, I will, though reluctantly, go personally so far as to authorize a message to be carried in my name to the duke of Portland, expressing a desire that he and Mr. Pitt may meet to confer on the means of forming an administration, on a wide basis, as the only means of entirely healing the divisions which stop the business of the nation. The only person I can think, from his office, as well as personal character, proper to be sent by me, is lord Sydney ; but should the duke of Portland, when required by me, refuse to meet Mr. Pitt, more especially upon the strange plea he has as yet held forth, I must here declare, that I shall not deem it right for me ever to address myself again to him.

“ ‘ The message must be drawn on paper, as must every thing in such a negotiation, as far as my name is concerned ; and I trust, when I next see Mr. Pitt, if, under the present circumstances, the other ministers shall agree with him in thinking such a proposition advisable, that he will bring a sketch of such a message, for my inspection. “ ‘ GEORGE, R.” (Vol. i. p. 293—295.)

After Mr. Fox's motion, on the 8th of March, 1784, for a representation to his Majesty, complaining of the inattention which the former addresses of the House, on the subject

of the appointment of an effectual administration, had been treated, was carried only by a majority of one,—Mr. Pitt sent to his Majesty an account of what had passed in the House of Commons; the King returned the following answer:

“ ‘ Mr. Pitt’s letter is, undoubtedly, the most satisfactory I have received for many months. An avowal on the outset, that the proposition held forth is not intended to go farther lengths than a kind of manifesto; and then carrying it by a majority of only one, and the day concluded with an avowal, that all negotiation is at an end, gives me every reason to hope, that by a firm and proper conduct, this faction will, by degrees, be deserted by many, and at length be forgot. I shall ever with pleasure consider, that by the prudence, as well as rectitude, of one person, in the house of commons, this great change has been effected; and that he will ever be able to reflect with satisfaction, that in having supported me, he has saved the constitution, the most perfect of human formation.’ ” (Vol. i. p. 321.)

The dissolution of parliament soon followed. It took place on the 24th of March, and the new parliament was summoned to meet on the 18th of May. From this period we know how firmly Mr. Pitt was seated in power, and how wisely and magnanimously for himself, and beneficially for the nation, he maintained it, with the exception of one short intermission, to the period of his premature death, in the beginning of the year 1806. The summing up of the minister’s conduct, at the end of the protracted struggle which we have been considering, seems to us to be manly, fair, and judicious.

“ Nor would even the joint support of the house of lords, and of the people, have availed, unless Mr. Pitt had possessed, not only very superior talents for debate, but a firmness and composure, which rendered ineffectual the most violent personal attacks, and the most irritating language, ever remembered in parliament, or indeed which can possibly be conceived. Though these attacks and this language were continued through a series of eight weeks, it does not appear that he was once off his guard; or that, young as he was, he gave his adversaries an opportunity of taking advantage of a single hasty, or inconsiderate expression. With undaunted spirit and correct judgment he maintained the lawful rights of the crown, without trenching upon the constitutional privileges of parliament. He gained the favor of the people, while he defended the prerogative of the king. Loudly as his mode of coming into office was complained of, and bitter as were the invectives against him, no one ventured to assert, that any step which he had taken, or any opinion which he had delivered, rendered him unfit to serve the public. The utmost rancor of party spirit could only require, that he should share political power with others; and even the first department in government was not denied him by his most determined opponents. All the reproaches heaped upon him, and all the accusations directed against him, were resolvable into this simple fact, that he was not supported by a majority of the

house of commons. And while his enemies were thus unable to fix upon him any positive charge of a serious nature, his abilities, his temper, his discretion, his courage, and his principles, became equally the objects of general praise and admiration. A minister, retaining his situation against the declared sense of the house of commons, was a new event in our parliamentary history, since the revolution; and the astonishment, arising from the novelty and supposed impossibility of the case, was greatly increased, by the consideration, that the person who was carrying on this unexampled struggle, had not yet completed his 25th year; and that he had, without the assistance of a single member of the cabinet, to contend with many persons of great abilities and experience, and particularly with two men of most distinguished talents, long accustomed to political warfare, who, after being for many years at the head of opposite parties, suddenly coalesced, for the purpose of forcing themselves into power; and who, being recently dismissed from office, were now endeavouring, with united strength, and by cordial co-operation, to seize the government a second time, against the will of their sovereign.

"Mr. Fox took the more active part; and it is impossible for any one to read the debates, without admiring the ability and dexterity, with which he conducted the contest. He dwelt, with the most consummate art and ingenuity, upon topics calculated to procure himself favor with the house of commons, and with the public, and to excite odium against his opponents. He endeavoured to persuade the house, that he was struggling for their importance, for maintaining their just and constitutional weight in the government of the country; and that his defeat would be followed by their loss of all real power. He carried the house from step to step—from resolution to resolution—and from address to address, each stronger than the preceding. He made an attempt, in the most cautious and least alarming manner, to withhold the supplies; and when that failed, he suggested, with the same wariness, the idea of a short mutiny bill. He failed again; but in both instances he contrived to hint at the proposal, and to abandon it, without committing himself, or alienating those, whose good opinion he most wished to retain. He declaimed against secret influence, a subject to which public feeling is generally alive; and described himself as a victim to court intrigue and private cabal in consequence of his known attachment to the cause of the people. He intimated, that the continuance of the present ministers in office, might lead to a repetition of those troubles and calamities, which in the preceding century, had originated in a dispute between the king and his parliament, and had ended in a civil war, and the overthrow of the constitution. He tried the effect, both of the keenest invective and of well-judged compliment, upon Mr. Pitt: he even made concessions respecting his favorite India bill, with the hope of gaining credit for a moderate and conciliatory spirit; and that the whole blame of the present unsettled state of affairs might be imputed to Mr. Pitt, he professed a wish not to exclude him from office, but declared himself ready to form, in conjunction with him, such an administration, as the situation of the country demanded. In publicly speaking of

the gentlemen, who met at the St. Alban's tavern, and in his private communications with their committee, he managed with so much address, that he attached to him several persons, who previously had not been favorably disposed to his principles or conduct. And when he had exhausted all the means of direct attack and active opposition, he suffered public business to proceed without impediment or molestation, with a view to prevent a dissolution of parliament, by exciting a belief that it was not necessary to have recourse to that measure."

"Great, however, as was the skill with which Mr. Fox acted throughout the contest, his exertions proved unsuccessful as to their main object; and his situation, at the end of the struggle, must have been truly mortifying to an ambitious man. At an early period of his life, he engaged, as has been mentioned, in an opposition to lord North, after having held office under him. Every year increased his weight and importance in the house of Commons. He became confessedly the most powerful debater of his own party; and at length succeeded in driving lord North from the helm of government. In less than a twelvemonth from that time, he prevailed upon this noble lord, who had been prime minister for twelve years, and had numerous adherents, to join his standard, and to act a subordinate part to him, both in the cabinet and in parliament. Mr. Fox, the foreign secretary of state, was suffered to frame a plan, and bring forward a bill, relative to our possessions in India, which, according to established rule, belonged to the department of lord North, the home secretary of state; and in this, and in every other business, he acted as the first and efficient minister. This measure, however objectionable, was sanctioned by the most decided majorities in the house of commons. Mr. Pitt's eloquence was exerted in vain; and Mr. Fox, after exposing the weakness of his opponents, carried his bill, with unusual marks of triumph, to the house of lords; not doubting but it would pass that house, with the same facility; and anticipating, as we may suppose, that continuance of power, which it was the object of the bill to secure. But, in the midst of these apparently well-grounded hopes and expectations, he met with a sudden and complete disappointment. The bill was rejected by the house of lords, and its author dismissed from his majesty's service. Still, however, Mr. Fox commanded a majority in the house of commons, with which immense advantage he openly asserted, that his immediate return to office was certain and inevitable; and he probably flattered himself, that he should derive additional strength from the failure of the attempt to exclude him from power. He might naturally imagine, that the youth and inexperience of Mr. Pitt, would not dare to resist a majority of the house of commons, to which every other minister had instantly yielded; and he might hope, that Mr. Pitt's acceptance of office under such circumstances, and his compelled relinquishment of it after so short a time—a consequence which would then have been represented as odious to every one but himself—would fix upon him the imputation of rashness and presumption, and operate in a manner injurious to his character. Here Mr. Fox was again disappointed. He prevailed indeed, as far as a majority was concerned, in every motion

which he made in the house of commons, for two successive months; but the most hostile resolutions against ministers, and the most importunate addresses to the throne, equally failed of producing their desired effect. Mr. Pitt persevered, boldly avowing his determination not to resign; and his Majesty was no less firm in refusing to dismiss him. In the mean time, the people gave the most unequivocal proofs of their approbation of Mr. Pitt's conduct, and as strongly condemned that of his opponents. Public opinion must ever affect the votes of the house of commons. Mr. Fox's majorities gradually decreased; and the plain intimations, which he received from some of his most respectable supporters, convinced him, that if he proceeded to acts of greater violence, he should experience and proclaim the loss of that confidence, which had been his proudest boast, and the ground of all his pretensions. Unable, therefore, to take any further step, without resource and without alternative, he felt himself under the humiliating necessity of giving up the contest, and of submitting to the rising fame and wonderful talents of a man, whose opposition, at the beginning of the struggle, he had considered as by no means formidable, and who was not only much younger than himself, but of an age at which no one had ever before attained either the same weight in parliament, the same situation in government, or the same popularity in the country. And to complete Mr. Fox's mortification, he could not but foresee, that the dissolution of parliament, which he had reason to expect would soon take place, must, in the present state of the public mind, still more diminish his own influence, and confirm the power of his rival." (Vol. i. p. 338—345.)

The succeeding stage of Mr. Pitt's political career was extremely brilliant. His majority in parliament was very large and decisive, and his triumph the greatest that intellect and integrity have ever achieved; but a succession of difficulties still awaited him, to keep his talents in perpetual exertion. A heavy imposition of taxes was necessarily his first measure; to this succeeded his India Bill, and his plan for redeeming the national debt; till at length, the critical situation of the country, produced by the King's intellectual malady, brought upon him a new and perilous crisis, from which, though all who could estimate him aright knew well he would emerge with honour, yet few anticipated the great additional glory with which it was to invest him, and the utter discomfiture and mortification which it was to produce to his adversaries. Of the busy interval to which we have last alluded, we have no room to dwell upon the transactions; but there appear in the Bishop's account of it, two letters from the King to Mr. Pitt, which are so marked with good sense, and manly and right feeling, that we cannot refuse ourselves the pleasure of extracting them. The first was written on his Majesty's receiving notice of Mr. Pitt's India Bill having been carried by a majority of 271 to 60.

“ ‘ It is with infinite pleasure I have received Mr. Pitt's note, containing the agreeable account of the committee on the East India bill having been opened by the division of so very decided a majority. I trust this will prevent much trouble being given in its farther progress, and that this measure may lay a foundation for, by degrees, correcting those shocking enormities in India, which disgrace human nature; and if not put a stop to, threaten the expulsion of the company out of that wealthy region. I have the more confidence of success, from knowing Mr. Pitt's good sense, which will make him not expect, that the present experiment shall at once prove perfect; but that by an attentive eye, and an inclination to do only what is right, he will, as occasions arise, be willing to make such improvements as may, by degrees, bring this arduous work to some degree of perfection.’ ” (Vol. i. pp. 400, 401.)

The second was in answer to a communication from Mr. Pitt of the plan of the propositions he was about to bring before the House for a reform in Parliament. It was written on the 20th of March, 1785.

“ ‘ I have received Mr. Pitt's paper, containing the heads of his plan, for a parliamentary reform, which I look on as a mark of attention. I should have delayed acknowledging the receipt of it till I saw him on Monday, had not his letter expressed, that there is but one issue of the business he could look upon as fatal, that is, the possibility of the measure, being rejected by the weight of those who are supposed to be connected with government. Mr. Pitt must recollect, that though I have ever thought it unfortunate, that he had early engaged himself in this measure, yet that I have ever said, that as he was clear of the propriety of the measure, he ought to lay his thoughts before the house; that out of personal regard to him, I would avoid giving any opinion to any one, on the opening of the door to parliamentary reform, except to him; therefore, I am certain, Mr. Pitt cannot suspect my having influenced any one on the occasion. If others choose, for base ends, to impute such a conduct to me, I must bear it as former false suggestions. Indeed, on a question of such magnitude, I should think very ill of any man, who took a part on either side, without the maturest consideration, and who would suffer his civility to any one, to make him vote contrary to his own opinion. The conduct of some of Mr. Pitt's most intimate friends on the Westminster scrutiny, shews, there are questions, men will not, by friendship, be biassed to adopt.’ ” (Vol. i. pp. 449, 450.)

On the subject of the Regency, the Bishop's remarks are very pertinent and conclusive, and deserve to be extracted.

“ The subject of the regency gave rise to the second parliamentary contest of extraordinary difficulty, and involving essential principles of our constitution, in which Mr. Pitt was engaged: I shall offer a few observations upon what passed at this interesting crisis.

In 1784, Mr. Pitt had defended the prerogative of the crown against a powerful party, aided by a majority of the house of com-

mons, who virtually denied the right of the king to appoint his own ministers; and now he stood forward in support of the privileges of parliament, against the same set of men, strengthened by the confident expectation of their immediately succeeding to the administration of the country, who asserted the absolute right of the heir apparent to the throne, to exercise all the functions of royalty, during the illness of the king, independently of the authority of the remaining branches of the legislature. On the former occasion, he acted on the defensive, having chiefly to repel the attacks of his enemies; on the present, he was called upon to form and bring forward a plan, for carrying on the government of the country, under unprecedented and most delicate circumstances. Both these arduous, but very different, situations he maintained with the same ability, firmness, and manly spirit; and we have seen that, in both, he was equally successful in defeating the unconstitutional attempts of his formidable and violent opponents:

“ Though Mr. Pitt denied an inherent right in the Prince of Wales to assume and exercise the whole powers of the crown, upon the declared incapacity of the king, yet he was decidedly of opinion, that his royal highness, as heir apparent of full age, had a claim of priority, above every other subject, to be invested with such part of the royal prerogatives, as the two houses of parliament should judge requisite, for administering the government during that short period, beyond which it was hoped that a regency would not be necessary. The former he did not admit, because it would have been incompatible with the rights of parliament, and might have been dangerous to the welfare and interests of the king, who was still upon the throne, and who might soon be capable of resuming the exercise of his royal authority. The latter he allowed, because it was the best mode of supplying the temporary defect in an essential branch of the legislature; and because the appointment of any other person as regent, might have been injurious to the future rights of the heir apparent; and, in the mean time, productive of much cabal, confusion, and mischief in the kingdom. Indeed, the claim of his royal highness, upon the ground of propriety, discretion, and expediency, appeared to him as clear on the one side, as the question of strict right did on the other. Mr. Fox, who at first contended in the most positive and unqualified terms, for the right of the prince, did not think it prudent to advise his royal highness to assert that right; and he afterwards eagerly deprecated all discussion upon the subject, in which he was joined by his political friends. The same wish on the part of the prince himself, was also declared by the duke of York, in the house of lords. Had Mr. Fox felt any confidence in his own doctrine, he would not have been anxious to prevent an inquiry into its truth; and had the right been really considered as well founded, there was no reason why it should not have been formally asserted by the prince. As, however, this right had been once maintained by so distinguished a person, and not afterwards disclaimed either by him or by the prince, ministers deemed it indispensably necessary, that the question should undergo a full investigation, and be decided in both houses, as a point which might affect future ages.

"Mr. Pitt not only unequivocally acknowledged from the first, that no claim could come into competition with that of the prince of Wales, but he also admitted, that if his majesty's illness should prove of long continuance, his royal highness ought to be invested by parliament, with all the powers and prerogatives belonging to the sovereign of these kingdoms. This distinction between a short and a long regency, was surely founded on just principles of reason and sound policy; and a regard to it was strongly demanded by the peculiarity of the well-known circumstances, under which the present regency was to be established.

"A regent is, in truth, no part of the British constitution, and those who argued for the right of the prince of Wales, could not support their opinion by statute or common law: when called upon, they could produce no authentic document explaining or conferring the powers and duties of a regent. No such person or character as regent, was mentioned in any law then in force; and of course no oath was prescribed to a regent, corresponding to the king's coronation oath; and had the proposed address, inviting the prince of Wales to undertake the regency, passed the two houses of parliament, he must have entered upon the government of the country, without the security required from the king, that he would "govern the people of this kingdom of England, and the dominions therunto belonging, according to the statutes in parliament agreed on, and the laws and customs of the same." The want of a regent's oath is of itself a sufficient proof, that a regent is not a constituent branch or member of our government; and that no person can, under any circumstances, during the life of a king, claim that office by hereditary right. *Nemo est hæres viventis*, is a known and acknowledged maxim of our laws, applying with equal force to every description of right or property, and to every rank and condition of men without any exception or distinction. The hereditary right to the crown and to the exercise of the royal functions, like every other right of inheritance, attaches only upon the death of the person in possession. The necessity of delegating a certain portion of the royal authority, on account of the incapacity of the king, had frequently arisen, and it could not but be foreseen, that similar instances might hereafter occur, but our ancestors prescribed no general and binding rules for cases of that kind. They thought it far better, that the two remaining branches of the legislature should make a particular provision for each case, adapted to its own exigency. They were probably aware, that great difficulties and dangers might arise, from giving the full powers of sovereignty to the next heir, while there was a king upon the throne, incapable from infancy or infirmity, of exercising the royal functions; and that the specific restrictions which might be requisite, must depend upon existing circumstances, and could not be previously determined. The rule of succession to the throne, and the prerogatives of the king, are accurately and authoritatively defined. But who shall be regent, and what shall be his powers, are points left to be settled by parliament, whenever it shall become

necessary, that some one should act in the room of the lawful possessor of the crown.

“The practice has been strictly conformable to these principles.” (Vol. ii. p. 203—207.)

But the great event was now approaching which was to give the severest blow to the reputation of the Whig party, and to place the courage, wisdom, and disinterestedness of Mr. Pitt at its highest point of distinction. The gathering peril was seen and deprecated by the wisest men of the country; but Mr. Fox acted under an infatuation only to be explained by referring it to the blindness induced by party politics. The French revolution was a powerful test for proving the strength of public principles. In the mind of Mr. Burke, adverse to all visionary and violent changes of polity, and to all invasions of liberty and property under pretence of reformation; full of suspicions of all untried theories, and abstract questions of competency and right, the first dawnings of the French revolution gave birth to the most painful prognostics; but, even after the system of murder, confiscation, and atheism, which attended its progress, had begun to declare itself, Mr. Fox stated in the House of Commons, that “he had been a strenuous advocate for a balance of power while France was that intriguing, restless nation which she had formerly proved;—now that the situation of France was altered—that they had created a Government from which neither insult nor injustice was to be dreaded by her neighbours, he was extremely indifferent concerning the balance of power: he, for one, admired the new constitution of France, considered altogether, as the most stupendous and glorious edifice of liberty which had been erected on the foundation of human integrity in any time or country.” We find him afterwards, in terms of the most pointed contradiction to Mr. Burke’s opinions, declaring that “the old constitution of France was essentially bad, and every thing was to be risked to destroy it; the constitution of Great Britain was essentially good, and every thing ought to be risked to preserve it.” By such childish and impetuous aphorisms he lost the confidence of all deep-thinking men, and sunk in the esteem of many of his own party, from the reputation of a great statesman, to the second praise of the “most brilliant debater” of his time. The separation which ensued between Mr. Fox and Mr. Burke upon this occasion, and the subsequent secession of many other of his ablest coadjutors, is succinctly, perhaps too succinctly, related by the Bishop of Winchester. Those touching parliamentary scenes in which Mr. Burke, with a sort of melancholy magnificence of thought and expression, condemned the tenets of his former associates, which discovered their union for ever; and exposed to view the dangers which

threatened his country from the possible diffusion of principles which had marked their progress by crime, pollution, and sacrilege, are among the finest subjects for meditation which that era presents: and though Mr. Pitt was not involved personally in the great quarrel, yet the subject of it extended over the rest of his existence, and was the source from which arose the consummation of his character, and the means of encircling him with a rampart of intelligence and virtue that enabled him to save the country.

It is singular that Mr. Fox could declare it as his opinion, that the speech which Mr. Burke delivered on the Report of the Committee on the Army Estimates, was the wisest, as well as the most brilliant, which he had ever heard;—in which speech was exposed all the wickedness and folly of the proceedings of the French regenerators, and yet that he could persevere in his laudatory declamations on the character of the revolution itself. Still he could not, or would not, discern the consequences of that rapid development of mental energy in a country, and in a state of things, unprepared to give it counterpoise or direction,—of the approaching conflict between cupidity, backed by power, and property, supported only by title,—of a philosophy discarding the very basis of moral actions, and giving its atheistical charter to the worst passions and appetites of the basest natures. It was otherwise with the virtuous man whose life is before us. In the midst of the storm he kept his hand upon the helm, and summoned all the energies of his countrymen to the relief of the vessel. Mr. Burke was worn out, and had retired, after bequeathing to the world the greatest work of practical, political wisdom, in his *Reflections on the Revolution of France*, which the combination of genius, philosophy, and experience, has been able to produce; and Mr. Pitt was left to carry his lessons into life and operation, and bear them home to the business and bosoms of his countrymen. He had now been ten years at the head of government; he had raised his country from its financial depression; he had doubled its commerce, he had multiplied on all sides its influence and its resources; and if he was not in the enjoyment of the favour of the vulgar, he had in the fullest measure the esteem of the wise; he had, besides, a larger share than any man living of that deep regard, which, however dormant when nothing threatens, effervesces and expands in times of alarm and danger: Such as rallied round the Scipios and the Æmili when Rome began to tremble for her fate. His character, as well as his eloquence, was of a description to suit the exigency; he had, in an eminent degree, that sort of courage which imparts and propagates itself; it was calmest when things were most agitated around it;

nd it stood, with a sort of insular security, in the midst of an ocean of storms.' His eloquence, too, was of the same character; his manner was always great and commanding; but during the period, perhaps the most truly threatening which this country has experienced, in which French principles were fast making their way into Britain, it was observed that his speeches were characterised by a peculiar propriety, dignity, and sedateness of elocution. He was always equally master of himself and of his subject; and amidst the most violent and insulting language of his opponents, held on his equable tenour, with a manliness of temper and courage, that nothing could provoke or disarm. His great business was to sustain the mind of his country at a pitch above the reach of revolutionary contagion,—to qualify it to understand and appreciate its actual felicity,—to see the consequence of a departure from the faith and principles of its ancestry; and to distrust a philosophy that had already half wasted the civilized world. For this purpose, day after day, he encountered the evil, and exposed it, with all the thunder of his words and all the lightning of his illustrations. His eloquence was always of that informed and pregnant kind which never tires; full of permanent and just ideas, practicable propositions, intelligible details, and vigorous and solemn appeals. To these talents and to this conduct, we owe our present safety, and perhaps our political existence; and for this the name of William Pitt is destined to live until gratitude and memory shall be extinct upon earth.

The details of the French Revolution have grown wearisome by repetition. The Bishop has therefore properly avoided being prolix or circumstantial in his references to them. His present work ends with the declaration and commencement of the war, and shows, very satisfactorily, that hostilities originated with the French. We think, therefore, that we may fairly take our leave of him here, for the present; having protracted this article already far beyond our first intention, and having really been obliged, from the little time the work has been in our hands, to gallop through its pages. We have some observations to make on the language, which we postpone till the rest of the work shall have come before the public, for which we wait with some impatience, both because we are eager to have more of the particulars of Mr. Pitt's private life from such authority, and because we propose, with these documents in our hands, to go ourselves more largely and descriptively into the character of the great subject of these Memoirs. In the mean time, we cordially thank the Lord Bishop for adding to his other useful contributions to the intellectual treasures of his country, the history of its glorious preserver and greatest ornament.

NEW BOOKS

PUBLISHED FROM MARCH TO MAY 1821.

ANTIQUITIES, ARCHITECTURE, SCIENCES, AND FINE ARTS.

Historic Notices in reference to Fotheringay; Illustrated by Engravings. By the Rev. H. R. Bonney, MA. Author of the Life of Bishop Taylor, 8vo. 7s. 6d. large paper 15s.

A Walk round Mount Edgumbe, with a Plan and Eight Views in the Park and Pleasure Grounds. Super-royal 8vo. 1l.

The History of Thirsk, including an Account of its once celebrated Castle, and other Antiquities in the Neighbourhood. 8vo. 5s.

The Destination of Works of Art, and the Use to which they are applied, considered with regard to their Influence on the Genius and Taste of Artists, &c. Translated from the French by H. Thomson, RA. 5s. 6d.

A Series of Etchings, portraying the Physiognomy, Manners, and Character of the People of France and Germany. By George Lewis. To be completed in three Parts, each containing 20 Plates. Part I. Imperial 8vo. 1l. 1s.—medium 4to. 1l. 1s.—Proofs on royal 4to. 1l. 11s. 6d.

BIOGRAPHY.

Memoirs of the Rev. Mark Wilks, late of Norwich. By Sarah Wilks, his Daughter. With an Appendix, containing Sermons, Letters, and various Interesting Documents. Portrait by Fry, 12mo. 7s.

Life of the Duke de Berry. By M. de Chateaubriand, 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Select Female Biography; comprising Memoirs of Eminent British Ladies derived from original and other authentic Sources, 12mo. 6s. 6d.

Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Right Rev. Brian Walton, DD.; Lord Bishop of Chester, Editor of the London Polyglot Bible. With Notices of his Coadjutors in that illustrious Work, &c. &c. By the Rev. J. Todd, MA. FSA. 2 vols. 8vo. with Portrait, 1l. 1s.

The Life of William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, with an Appendix, containing the Diary of the learned Henry Wharton. Also the remaining Works, now scarce, of Archbishop Sancroft. By the Rev. George D'Oyly, DD. FRS. 2 vols. 8vo. with Portrait, 1l. 4s.

Memoirs of the Life of the Right Hon. Wm. Pitt. By George Tomline, DD. Bishop of Winchester. Vols. I. and II. 4to.

Memoirs of Wm. Wallace, Esq. descendant of the illustrious Hero of Scotland, late of the 15th Hussars, with a Portrait, 8vo. 10s. 6d.

DRAMA, NOVELS, &c.

Conscience, or the Bridal Night, a Tragedy, in Five Acts. By James Haynes, Esq. 8vo. 4s.

St. Aubin; or, The Infidel; a Novel, 2 vols. 14s.

The Favourite of Nature, 3 vols. 12mo. 1l. 1s.

Montalto, a Tragedy, in Five Acts, as it was originally written.

The Eve of St. Hypolito, 3s.

Biddyn, a Welch National Tale. By W. S. Wickenden, 12mo. 7s.

Helen de Tournon, 2 vols. 12mo. 10s. 6d.

Hamlet, and As You Like It; a Specimen of the new Edition of Shakspeare. By Thomas Caldecott, Esq. royal 8vo. 15s.

A Tale of the Olden Time. By a Harrow Boy, 12mo.

A Legend of Argyle, or, 'Tis a Hundred Years Since. 3 vols. 12mo. 1*l.* 1*s.*
 Dramatic Works of the Right Hon. R. B. Sheridan. Now first collected and edited, with a Preface. By Thomas Moore, Esq. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 8*s.*
 Valerius; a Roman Story. 3 vols. 12mo. 1*l.* 4*s.*
 Concealment, a Novel. 3 vols. 12mo. 1*l.* 1*s.*
 The Vicar of Iver, a Tale. By the Author of the Italian Convert. 3*s.* 6*d.*
 The Sisters, a Novel. 4 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 8*s.*

EDUCATION.

Il Bagatello, intended to facilitate the Study of Italian to Young Beginners. By E. Reale, 12mo. 3*s.*

Theory and Practice; or, a Guide to the French Language; on an Easy and Methodical Plan. By J. Maurois. 12mo. 5*s.* 6*d.* bound.

Aikin's Annals of George III. Abridged for the Use of Schools. 12mo. 4*s.* 6*d.* bound.

The Sacred History of the Old Testament, abridged in the Language of the Bible. For the Use of Children. By Ralph Barnes, Esq. 12mo. 4*s.*

Bible Rhymes, on the Names of all the Books of the Old and New Testament, with Allusions to some of the principal Incidents and Characters. By Hannah More. Small 8vo. 3*s.*

A Compendium of the History of the Jewish Kings, for the Amusement and Instruction of Youth; with 16 coloured Prints. 8mo. 3*s.*

HISTORY.

General History of the Royal Family of Great Britain. By Andrew Halliday, MD. 4to. 2*l.* 10*s.*

Narrative of the Campaigns of the British Army at Washington and New Orleans, in 1814-15. By an Officer. 8vo. 12*s.*

Memoirs. By James Earl Waldegrave, KG. one of his Majesty's Privy Council in the Reign of George II., and Governor of George III. when Prince of Wales; being a short Account of Political Contentions, &c. from 1754 to 1757. Small 4to. with a Portrait, 1*l.* 5*s.*

Memoirs of the Revolution of Mexico; with a Narrative of Mina's Campaign, &c. Map, and a Portrait of Mina. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 4*s.*

A History of the British Revolution of 1688-9, recording all the Events in England, Scotland, and Ireland, down to the Capitulation of Limerick, 1691, inclusive. By Geo. Moore, Esq. 8vo. 1*l.* 1*s.*

Substance of Lectures on the Ancient Greeks, and on the Revival of Greek Learning in Europe, delivered in the University of Edinburgh, by the late Andrew Dalzell, Prof. of Greek, AM. FRSE. By John Dalzell, Esq. Advocate. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 4*s.*

An Essay on the History of the English Government and Constitution, from the Reign of Henry VII., to the present Time. By Lord John Russell. Post 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

MEDICINE, SURGERY, AND PHYSIOLOGY.

Practical Observations on those Disorders of the Liver, and other Organs of Digestion, which produce the several Forms, and Varieties of the Bilious Complaint. New and enlarged Edition. By Joseph Ayre, MD. 8*s.* 6*d.* boards.

A Treatise on the Epidemic Cholera of India. By James Boyle, 8vo. 5*s.*

A Treatise on the Medical Powers of the Nitro-Muriatic Acid Bath in various Diseases, with Cases. By Walter Dunlop, Surgeon. 8vo. 2*s.*

A Manual of the Diseases of the Human Eye, from the best National and Foreign Works; translated from the German of Dr. Weller, and illustrated with Cases. By G. C. Monteath, MD. Illustrated by four highly coloured Plates, and one Plate of Instruments. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 10*s.*

Practical Observations on Midwifery. By John Ramsbottom, MD. 8vo. Part I. 10*s.* 6*d.*

A Practical Treatise on the Inflammatory, Organic, and Sympathetic Diseases of the Heart: also on Malformation, Aneurism, &c. By Henry Reeder, MD. RMS. Edin. and MCS. Lond.

A Treatise on the Hydrocephalus Acutus, by Leopold Anthony Golis. Translated from the German, by Robert Good, MD. 8vo. 8s.

Observations on the Derangement of the Digestive Organs, and some Views of their Connection with Local Complaints. By Wm. Law, Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons, Edinburgh. 8vo. 6s.

A Toxicological Chart, exhibiting at one View, the Symptoms, Treatment, and Modes of Detecting the various Poisons, Mineral, Vegetable, and Animal, according to the latest Experiments. By W. Stowe, RCS. London. 1s. 6d.

A Treatise on Indigestion and its Consequences, called Nervous and Bilious Complaints, with Observations on the Organic Diseases, in which they sometimes terminate. By A. P. Wilson Phillip, MD. FRS. &c. 8vo. 4s.

MISCELLANEOUS.

An Elementary Treatise on Mechanics. By W. Whewell, AM. Fellow of Trinity College, Vol. I. containing Statics, and Part of Dynamics, 8vo. 15s.

Hints to teach Children the First Principles of Music, 12mo. 3s.

The Domestic Brewer, and Family Wine-maker. By B. Parke. 3s. 6d.

A Treatise on Naval Gunnery. By Colonel Sir Howard Douglas, Bart. KSC. CB. FSR., &c. &c. with Plates. 8vo. 15s.

Elementary Illustration of the Celestial Mechanics of Laplace. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The Young Navigator's Guide to the Sidercal and Planetary Parts of Nautical Astronomy; being the Theory and Practice of finding the Latitude, the Longitude, and the Variation of the Compass by the fixed Stars and Planets. To which is prefixed, the Description and Use of the new Celestial Planisphere. By Thomas Kerigan, Purser, R.N. Royal 8vo. 18s. boards.

Table Talk, or Original Essays. By W. Hazlitt. 8vo. 14s.

Letter to —, on the Rev. W. L. Bowles' Strictures on the Life and Writings of Pope. By the Right Hon. Lord Byron. 3s. 6d.

A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord Byron, protesting against the Immolation of Gray, Cowper, and Campbell, at the Shrine of Pope.

A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord Byron on Poetical Criticism, in Answer to his Lordship's Letter. By the Rev. W. L. Bowles.

Essays on Various Subjects, Religious and Moral, &c. By a Layman. 3 vols. 8vo. 1l. 11s. 6d.

Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society. Vol. I. Part I. 4to. 1l.

Practical Economy; or the Application of Modern Discoveries, to the Purposes of Domestic Life. 12mo. 7s. 6d.

The North Georgia Gazette, and Winter Chronicle, a Newspaper that was established on Board the Ships employed in a discovery of the North-West Passage, edited by Capt. Edw. Sabine, RA. 4to. 10s. 6d.

The Establishments of M. Emmanuel de Fellenberg, at Horffwyl, considered with reference to their Claim upon the Attention of Men in Public Stations. By Count Lewis de Villevielle. 8vo. 2s.

The Secretary's Assistant, exhibiting the various and most correct Modes of Superscription, Commencement and Conclusion of Letters, to Persons of every Degree of Rank, &c. &c. 12mo. 5s.

Fashionable Orthodoxy; or, the High Road to Préferment; containing suitable Directions for obtaining Popularity, Patrons, and Promotion in the Established Church; with Instructions for the Education of Young Gentlemen intended for the Ministry; and Hints for Ordination, Preaching, &c. &c. Exemplified from the best living Authorities. By Verax. 8vo. 8s.

NATURAL HISTORY.

Illustrations of British Ornithology. By P. J. Selby, Esq. Member of the Wernerian Natural History Society at Edinburgh, First Series, Land Birds, No. I. Elephant folio, 1l. 11s. 6d. coloured, 5l. 5s.

Elephantary Illustrations of the Celestial Mechanics of Laplace, 8vo. 10s. 6d. boards.

Illustrations of the Linnæan Genera of Insects. By W. Wood, FRS. FLS. Part I. with 14 coloured Plates, 5s. to be completed in Six Monthly Parts.

The Natural History System of Mineralogy. By Frederick Mohs, Prof. of Min. Frieberg, 8vo. 6s. 6d.

Flora Scotica, or a Description of Scottish Plants, arranged both according to the Artificial and Natural Methods; in two Parts, By W. Jackson Hooker, LL.D. F.R.A. FLS. &c. 8vo. 14s.

POETRY.

Poems. By P. M. James, foolscap 8vo. 7s.

The Last Days of Herculeum, and Abradates and Panthea. Poems, by Edwin Atherstone, foolscap 8vo. 5s.

Metrical Legends of Exalted Characters. By Mrs. Joannie Baillie, 8vo. 14s.

A Vision of Judgement. By Robert Southey, Esq. Poet Laureate, 4to.

Fleurs, a Poem, in Four Books, 4to. 10s. 6d.

The Lost Valentines Found, with other Trifles in Rhyme, 4s. 6d.

Scripture Melodies. By a Clergyman. Foolscap 8vo. 5s.

Sketches in Hindostan; with other Poems. By Thomas Medwin. 8vo. 5s. 6d.

The Doge of Venice, an Historical Tragedy, in Five Acts; with a Preface, Notes, and an Appendix of Original Documents; and the Prophecy of Dante. By the Right Hon. Lord Byron, 8vo. 12s.

The Fall of the Angels, a Poem, in Two Cantos, 8vo. 4s.

The Exiles of Damascus, a Poem. By John Cochrane, Esq. 8vo. 4s.

The Improvisatore, in Three Fyttes; with other Poems. By Thomas Lovell Beddoes, 12mo. 5s.

Ellen Fitz-Arthur, a metrical Tale. In Five Cantos. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

The Modern Church; a satirical Poem, comprising Sketches of some popular and unpopular Preachers. By J. L. Bicknell, FAS. 3s.

Takings; or the Life of a Collegian: a Poem. By R. Dagley, Author of "Select Gems," &c. with 26 Etchings. Royal 8vo. 1l. 1s.

The Universe; a Poem. By the Rev. Robert Maturin, Author of "Bertram," &c.

Saul, a Tragedy; translated from the Italian of Alfieri; and Jephtha's Daughter, a Scriptural Drama. By a Lady. Published for the Benefit of the British and Foreign Bible Society. 5s.

The Maniac; or the Fall of Reason: a Poem. 3s. 6d.

Childhood: a Poem. By the Rev. C. T. S. Hornby, A. M. Fellow of All Souls, Oxford. 5s. 6d.

The Omnipresence of the Supreme Being: a Seatonian Prize Poem. By E. B. Elliot, A.M. 2s. 6d.

Woman in India; a Poem. Part I. Female Influence. By the Rev. John Lawson, Missionary at Calcutta, and Author of "Orient Harping." 1s. 6d.

The Deluge: a Poem. First Part. In Three Books, in which the Author has ventured to use the angelic Agency of Milton. 3s. 6d.

POLITICS AND POLITICAL ECONOMY.

Remarks on Mr. Godwin's Inquiry concerning Population, 5s.

Statement of the Question of Parliamentary Reform, with a Reply to the Objections of the Edinburgh Review, No. LXI. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Letters to Mr. Malthus on several Subjects of Political Economy, and particularly on the Cause of the General Stagnation of Commerce. To which is added, a Catechism of Political Economy; or, Familiar Conversations on the Manner in which Wealth is produced, distributed, and consumed in Society. Translated from the French of J. B. Say. By John Richter, Esq. 8vo. 9s.

An Appeal to the Legislature and the Public on the Tendency of Mr. Brougham's Bill for the Education of the Poor. By J. B. Brown, Esq. of the Inner Temple. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Letters to the Catholics of Ireland, on the Right Hon. W. C. Plunkett's Two Bills, now pending in Parliament. By Daniel O'Connell, Esq.

Elements of the Art of Packing, as applied to Special Juries, particularly in Cases of Libel Law. By Jeremy Bentham, Esq. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

An Essay on the Political Economy of Nations. 8vo. 9s.

The Declaration of England against the Acts and Projects of Austria, Russia, Prussia, &c. 3s. 6d.

Critical Examination of the whole Subject of Reform in the House of Commons, &c. &c. By Geo. Wirgman. 2s.

Observations on the present State of the Police of the Metropolis. By Geo. B. Mainwaring, Esq. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

An Inquiry into those Principles respecting the Nature of Demand, and the Necessity of Consumption advocated. By Mr. Malthus, &c. 4s.

Observations on certain Verbal Disputes in Political Economy. 3s.

Brief Consideration of the present State of the Police of the Metropolis; with a few Suggestions towards its Improvement. By L. R. Allen, one of the Magistrates of Union-hall. 2s. 6d.

A View of the Causes, Tendency, and Events of the late Revolution in Portugal. 2s. 6d.

Memoirs of the Secret Societies of the South of Italy, particularly the Carbonari. 8vo. 12s.

An Appeal to the Legislature and the Public, more especially to Dissenters from the Established Church, on the Tendency of Mr. Brougham's Bill for the Education of the Poor, to augment the Poor Rates, to interfere with the Rights of Conscience, and infringe on the Spirit of the Toleration Acts, &c. By J. B. Brown, LL.D., &c. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

THEOLOGY.

Christian Revelation, contrasted with Pagan Superstition. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

Two Discourses on the Unity of the Church. By Thomas M'Crie, DD. 12mo. 3s.

Grace and Truth, or the Glory and Fulness of the Redeemer displayed. By the Rev. Wm. M'Ewen. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

Twenty Discourses, preached before the University of Cambridge in 1820, at the Lecture, founded by the Rev. J. Hulse. By the Rev. C. Benson, MA. 8vo. 12s.

Sermons on Infidelity. By the Rev. Andrew Thompson, AM. 18mo. 5s.

An Inquiry into the Doctrines of Necessity and Predestination. By Edward Copplestone, DD. &c. &c. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Sermons, dedicated, by Permission, to the King. By the Rev. Thomas Boys, AM. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Miscellaneous Thoughts on Divine Subjects; with Extracts from some of the best Religious Authors, and a small Selection of Texts. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

Dewar on Personal and Family Religion. A New Edition, enlarged. 8vo. 8s.

Remarks of the Bishop of Peterborough's Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome. By the Rev. G. Glover, AM. 8vo. 6s.

A general View of the Doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism. By Christopher Bethell, DD. Dean of Chichester. 8vo. 8s.

Sermons and Charges. By the Rev. John Hough, DD. President of St. Mary Magdalene College, Oxford, in the Reign of James II. and successively Bishop of Oxford, Litchfield and Coventry, and Worcester: with a Memoir of his Life. By W. Russell, BD. Fellow of Magdalene College. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Prejudice and Responsibility; or a Brief Inquiry into some of the Causes, and the Cure of Prejudice against Religion. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

The Book of Enoch the Prophet: an Apocryphal Production, supposed to have been lost for Ages, but discovered at the Close of the last Century in Abyssinia, now first translated from an Ethiopic MS. in the Bodleian Library.

By Richard Laurence, LLD. Regius Professor of Hebrew, Canon of Christ Church, &c. 9s.

A Country Parson's First Offering to his Mother Church; in Nine Pastoral Sermons. 3s.

A Clear Systematic View of the Evidences of Christianity; with Introductory Observations on the Popular Causes of Infidelity. By J. Macardy. 8vo. 6s.

Two Sermons: one on the Death of Mr. Billing; and the other addressed to Young Persons. By J. Styles, DD. 2s.

The Christian's Duty with respect to the Established Government and the Laws, considered in Two Sermons, preached before the University of Oxford. By the Rev. R. Whately, MA. Fellow of Oriel College. 8vo. 2s.

VOYAGES, TRAVELS, AND TOPOGRAPHY.

Letters from the Havannah during the Year 1820. Crown 8vo. 6s. 6d.

A Narrative of the Chinese Embassy to the Khan of the Tourgouth Tartars on the Banks of the Volga, in 1712-13-14-15. Translated from the Chinese, with other Miscellaneous Translations from the same. By Sir George Thomas Staunton, Bart. LLD. FRS. 8vo. with Maps, 18s.

Travels in Northern Africa, from Tripoli to Mourzouk, the Capital of Fezzan, and to the Southern Extremity of that Kingdom in 1818-19, and 20, with Geographical Notices of the Soudan, and of the Course of the Niger, &c. &c. By George Francis Lyon, Lieut. RN. and Companion of the late Mr. Ritchie. With Chart and coloured Plates of Costumes, 4to. 3l. 3s.

Travels in Georgia, Persia, Armenia, Ancient Babylonia, &c. &c. during 1817, 1818, 1819, 1820. By Sir Robert Ker Porter, 4to. with Engravings.

An Historical, Statistical, and Descriptive Account of the Philippine Islands; founded on official Data, and translated from the Spanish, with considerable Additions. By Wm. Walton, Esq. 8vo. 12s.

Classical Excursion from Rome to Arpino; with a Dissertation on the Political Conduct of Cicero, and on his Villas and Monuments. Plates. 12s.

A Bibliographical, Antiquarian, and Picturesque Tour in France and Germany. By the Rev. T. F. Dibdin, AM. Embellished with 140 Plates. 3 vols. super-royal 8vo. 10l. 10s.

A Tour through the Southern Provinces of the Kingdom of Naples. By the Hon. Richard Keppel Craven; with 14 Plates, by Charles Heath. 4to. 2l. 15s.

Journal of a Voyage for the discovery of a North-West Passage from the Atlantic to the Pacific, performed in the Years 1819-20, in His Majesty's Ships Hecla and Griper, under the Orders of W. E. Perry, RN. 4to. 3l. 13s. 6d.

Letters on the Scenery of Wales; including a Series of Subjects for the Pencil, with their Stations determined on a general Principle, and Instructions to Pedestrian Tourists. By the Rev. R. H. Newell, B.D. Author of "Remarks on Goldsmith." Royal 8vo. with Plates. 15s.

An Account of the Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia. By W. Wilkinson, Esq. late Consul to the above Principalities. 8vo. 9s.

The Journal of a Residence in the Burnham Empire, and more particularly at the Court of Amarapoorah. By Capt. Hiram Cox, with Plates. 8vo. 16s.

Sketches of Manners, Scenery, &c. in the French Provinces, Switzerland, and Italy: with an Essay on French Literature. By the late John Scott, Esq. 8vo. 12s.

Journal of a Voyage of Discovery to the Arctic Regions, in His Majesty's Ships Hecla and Griper, under the Command of Capt. Parry. By Alex. Fisher, Esq. Surgeon to the Hecla, with Maps. 8vo. 12s.

Notes on the Cape of Good Hope, made during an Excursion in that Colony, in the Year 1820. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Views of Society and Manners in America, in a Series of Letters from that Country to a Friend in England, during 1818, 19, and 20. By an Englishwoman. 8vo.

I N D E X

SEVENTEENTH VOLUME OF THE BRITISH REVIEW.

ÆGina statues, the, 297.

Æthroscope, 345.

Ali Pasha, his Serai at Ioannina, 306, 307—ditto at Brevesa, 302—his extortions, 303—Mr. Hughes's visit to, 303—his history, 310—attacks the Suliotcs, and repulsed, 312—blockades Suli, 312—his cruelty to the inhabitants, 313—claims Parga, 316—his character, 319—advantages resulting from his government, 319.

Arabs, fraudulent character of, 247.

Aristophanes, Mitchell's Translation of, 50—Brunck's edition, 51—an entire translation not to be wished for, 52—not generally studied at the Universities, 53—his grossness not altogether owing to the public taste, 56—his satire not corrective. 58—St. Chrysostom's predilection for, as an imposture of Aldus, 62—excuse for his impurity, 63—the Clouds a gross caricature of Socrates, 67—failure of that piece, 78—character of his dramas, 82—insurmountable difficulty of translating, 83—the invocation to Peace in the 'Acharnians,' 56.

Athenians, their licentious taste, 57—tyranny of their democracy, 60—their passion for defamation, 81—singular sacrifice of the modern Athenian women, 296.

Athens, 287—the Parthenon, 288—the Erechtheum, 292—the temple of Theæus, 292—dance of Derwiches in the Tower of the Winds, 293.

Atometer, 345.

Attorney-General, his speech, 18.

Authors, profligate, the enormity of their offence, 326.

Barometer, indications of the, 351.

Barristers, privileges and obligations of, 14.

Belzoni (G.), Narrative of the Operations and recent Discoveries in the Pyramids, &c. &c. 230—account of, 230—constructs an hydraulic machine for the Pasha of Egypt, 231, 233—departs for Thebes, 234—visits

the Temple of Tentyra, 234—lands at Luxor, 236—his adventure in a cave at Gournou, 237—arrives at Ombos, 239—embarkation of the bust of Memnon, 240—proceeds to Upper Egypt and Nubia, 241—discoveries at Thebes and Carnæ, 242—explores the sepulchres at Gournou, 244, 246—researches, 247—discovers a colossal head, 250—obliged to suspend his researches, 251—temple in Nubia, 251—tomb of Psammethis, 253—examines the Pyramids, 253—discovers the site of Berenice, 257, 258—never refers to the Scriptures, 259—has done little for natural history, 259.

Bentley (Rev. C.) The Chronology of our Saviour's Life, or an Inquiry into the true Time of the Birth, Baptism, and Crucifixion of Jesus Christ, 389—commendations of the work, 418.

Berenice, ruins of, 258.

Biblical criticism should be rendered as popular as the subject will permit, 420.

Bishops, caution necessary in selecting, 7.

British Review, independence of the, 2, 324.

Brougham (Mr.) 13, 14—the impolicy and erroneous principles of his speeches, 15.

Burke (E.), 461—his disapprobation of the French Revolution, 500.

Bute (Lord), 369—disliked by George II. 376.

Byron's (Lord), Marino Faliero and Prophecy of Dante, 439—his poetry essentially undramatic, 441—his egotism unfavourable to dramatic composition, 443—want of taste the great fault of his poetry, 451.

Caricatures, infamous, 7, 10, 34.

Carnæ, sublime ruins of the temple at, 242.

Castalian spring, the, described, 282—*waters*, a peculiar virtue in, discovered by Sir G. Wheeler, 283.

Cenci (The), a tragedy, by Percy

- Bysshe Shelley, 380 — undramatic nature of the subject, 381—the plot, 381—horrible and monstrous character of *Cenci*, 382—difference between this and other tragedies founded on similar circumstances, 385—defective in its structure, as a drama, 386.
- Charlotte*, the Princess, 336.
- Chatham* (Lord), unfavourable portrait of, by Earl Waldegrave, 368—letters from, to his son, 469.
- Cheops*, pyramid of, 256.
- Chronology of the Scriptures*, publications on, 389—the creation, 391—method of reckoning time, used by the Hebrews, 393—deluge, 394—descendants of *Adam*, 395—predictive chronology, 397—discontinuance of Hebrew dates during the residence of the Israelites in Egypt, 399—the temple founded, 400—*Amalekites*, 401—*Philistines*, 401—*Manetho*, 402—*Eratosthenes*, 403—difficulties caused by the preposterous dates assigned to the epoch of *Sesostris*, 404—*Volney's* charges against Christian chronology, 404—*Sesostris's* expedition, 405—simplicity of the chronology of the reigns of the kings of Israel and Judah, 408—chronology of *Ptolemy*, 409—*Cyaxares* or *Ahasuerus*, 411—charge against the prophecies of *Daniel*, 413—chronology of the Bible safe from the attacks of infidels, 416—chronology of the New Testament, 418—merits of *Mr. Benson's* work, 418, 421—Biblical criticism, 420—the futile reasonings of those who attack revelation, 421.
- Cleon*, character of, 59.
- Climate*, 339—of London, 346.
- Cockerell* (Mr.), discovers the *entasis* in the columns of the *Parthenon*, 294—the *Agina* statues excavated by him, 296.
- Comedy*, old Greek, its grossness, 56—characterized, 81—its anomalies, 82.
- Constitution*, British, its first germs not to be precisely defined, 46—its progressive improvement, 41.
- Cope* (Sir John), commands the army against the Pretender, 109—is defeated at the Battle of Preston Pans, 111—and escapes to England, 113.
- Country*, State of the, 1—the Queen, 2—her case, 4—appearance of the times, 5—the clergy and church, 6—purity in the hierarchy and church recommended, 7—dangerous influence of libels, 8—the disaffected attack the constitution through the crown, 9—the King's political conduct, 9—slanders against him, 10—the whig opposition, 14—uncharitable censures against the private feelings of the sovereign, 11—peculiar and critical state of affairs, 12—impolicy of demagogues of rank, 13—speeches for the Queen, 13—the Queen's replies to addresses, 26—letter to the King, 29—the Liturgy question, 30—Address from the King to his People, 33—declaration of the people of England, 37—British constitution, 40—whiggism, 42—representation of the country, virtual, if not proportionate, 46—cheering views for the future, 47.
- Cumberland* (Mr.), his attack upon *Socrates*, 65—his translation of the *Clouds* commended, 85.
- Currants*, cultivation and preparation of, 279.
- Cyaxares* or *Ahasuerus*, 411.
- Cyrus*, 409.
- Dale* (Thomas), the Outlaw of Taurus, a Poem; to which are added Scenes from *Sophocles*, 422.
- Dance*, Arabian, at Meimond, 241—of *Derwishes* at Athens, 293.
- Daniel*, his 'Visions' asserted by infidels to have been written after the occurrence of the predicted events, 413.
- Declaration of the People of England to the King*, 1.
- Delphi*, description of, 282—temple of *Apollo* at, 285—*Stadium* at, 287.
- Denman* (Mr.), 16—quotation from his speech, 18.
- Denon's* opinion of the architecture of *Tentyra*, 236.
- Differential* thermometer, 343.
- Dionysius*, the dog-sophist, 309.
- Dodwell* (Edward), Classical and Topographical Tour through Greece, 269—fidelity of his drawings, 277—his sensations on first viewing Greece, 278—condemns the spoliation of Athens, 289—his remarks on the sculptures in the British Museum, 291.
- Dramatic Poetry*, 381, 439—the French school of, 440—the peculiar interest requisite to, 442—theory of the source of the pleasure afforded by tragedy, 444.
- Edinburgh Review*, its inconsistency, 43.
- Egyptians*, their progress in the arts, 248.

- Eratosthenes*, his catalogue of the Theban kings, 396.
- *Euripides*, unjustly satirized by Aristophanes, 78—defended from the animadversions of Schlegel, 79—exceptions urged against, by Mr. Mitchell, 80—enthusiasm of Milton for, 80—testimony of Valknaer in favour of, 81.
- Fabér* (G. Stanley), his remarks on the Pyramids of Cephrenes, 230.
- Forbes* (John), Observations on the Climate of Penzance and the District of the Land's End, in Cornwall, 337.
- Fourmont* (Abbé), his destruction of ancient inscriptions, 299.
- Fox* (C. J.), 459—461—his coalition with Lord North, 480—his opinion on the influence of the Crown, 486—his India Bill, 487—his triumphant majorities, 489—his dexterity in opposing Mr. Pitt at the commencement of his administration, 494—ultimately foiled in his attempts, 496—his admiration of the French Revolution, 500—his inconsistency in commending a speech of Mr. Burke's, pointing out the atrocity of that very Revolution, 501.
- *Francis* (Dr.), his *Watson Refuted*; being an Answer to the Apology for the Bible, in a Series of Letters to the Bishop of Llandaff, 389—his impiety and ignorance, 414.
- Frederic the Great*, destitute of feeling, 91—his duplicity towards Voltaire, 92—his character as given by Mr. Standish, 93—his abominable cynicism, 97.
- Fretthinking Christians*, 180.
- French Drama*, its principles, 440.
- French Revolution*, 501.
- *Genesis*, particularly offensive to infidels, 390—attacked by them, 393.
- George II.*, a marriage intended by him for his grandson, 372—his extreme dislike of Lord Bute, 376—and of Lord Temple, 377—his difficulty respecting an administration, 378.
- George III.*, his letter to Mr. Pitt, 491.
- George IV.*, his character as a monarch, 9— inconsistency of the Whig Opposition towards, 10.
- *German Philosophy*, leading affectation of, 78.
- criticism, errors of, 79.
- Gifford* (Capt.), his "Unitarian's Defence," 151.
- Gosnell* (Mr.), his "Examination of the various Texts of Scripture, &c." 180.
- Gospel*, peculiar doctrines of, 149.
- Government*, ancient ones defective, 48
- —when it may be opposed, 49.
- Gournou*, the burial-place of Thebes, described, 244—manners of the inhabitants, 246—Fellahs of, 247.
- Greece*, Dodwell's Tour; and Hughes's Travels in, 269—associations attached to, 270—modern language of, 271—ancient usages still extant, 272—character of the modern Greeks, 273—political situation of, 274—Zacynthus (Zante), 278—discoveries in the Ionian Islands, 280—dinner at the Bishop of Salona's, 280—Delphi, 281—Parnassus, 284—temple of Apollo, 285—palace of ditto, 286—Athens; the Parthenon, 288—temple of Theseus, 292—dancing Derwishes, 293—the Stadium on the Ilissus, 295—Sunium, 296—Aegina, 296—statues, 297—Tempe, 298—Sparta, 299—Prevesa, 300—Nicopolis, 301—Ioannina, 306, 309—capricious tyranny of Ali Pasha, 306—his history, 310—Suliot Republic, 311—Parga, 315—customs of the modern Greeks, 320—their literature, 320.
- Greek Stage*, 82.
- Griesbach*, his edition of the New Testament does not materially affect the received text, 162—not favourable to Unitarianism, 163.
- Ham*, his family, 395—the founder of Thebes, Theis, and Memphis, 395.
- Haral's Henry VIII.* and George IV. 1.
- *Herodotus*, his error respecting the Egyptian mode of embalming, 247.
- Hexameters*, English, 321—not adapted to our language, 322—prior experiments with, 327.
- Historical Dramas and Novels*, difference between, 218.
- Horne* (Mr.), The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity briefly stated and defended, 137—his defence of the text of the Three Witnesses, 166.
- Howard* (Luke), The Climate of London deduced from Meteorological Observations, 337—his merits as a meteorologist, 346—analysis of his work, 347—proposes a new division of the seasons, 348—combats Dr. Hutton's theory of the causes of rain, 353—his theory of winds and weather, 359
- House of Commons*, 46.
- Hughes* (Rev. T. Smart), his Travels to Sicily, Greece, and Albania, 269—indulges in sentiment, 274.

- Humboldt*, his generalization of facts relative to meteorology, 341.
- Hutton* (Mr.), objects to prayer to Christ, 160.
- Hygrometer*, 343—*Leslie's*, *De Lue's*, *Daniels'*, 344.
- Infidels*, attend Unitarian places of worship, 185.
- Innovation*, political, hazard of, 479.
- Instruments*, meteorological, Mr. *Leslie's* Description of, 337, 343—improvements in, contemplated, 342—differential thermometer, pyrometer, photometer, 343—hygrometer, 344—æthroscope, atmometer, 345.
- Ioannina*, Ali Pasha's Serai at, 302—the city, 306, 309.
- Johnstone* (Chevalier de), *Memoirs* of the Rebellion in 1745-1746, 106—account of the author, 106—his incompetence to the office of Historian, 107—throws no new information on the subject of the Rebellion, 107—his autobiographical details interesting, 108—reasons assigned by him for the failure of the rebellion, 226—his opinion of the Pretender, 128—his personal adventures, 128—his concealment at Cortachic, 130—his escape over the Frith of Tay, 132—his asylum at Lady Jane Douglas's, 135—leaves England, 136—experienced great fidelity from those of the opposite cause, 137.
- Ithaca*, its situation doubtful, 277.
- Kenilworth*, a Romance, 216—tedious; founded on an anecdote in Miss Aikin's *Elizabeth*, 217—historic romances, how to be constructed; distinction between them and historic dramas, 218—incongruous character of *Leicester*; the character of *Elizabeth* drawn correctly, 219—that of *Amy* the prominent defect of the work, 220—many passages exhibit great genius, 226—precipitancy of the author's composition, 229.
- King*, the, Letter to, 29—legality of his interference with the Liturgy considered, 32.
- Law*, English, its excellence, 50.
- Lead*, extreme scarcity of in Egypt, 248.
- Leslie* (John), Description of Instruments designed for improving Meteorological Observations, 337.
- Letter from the King to his People, 1—its spirit, 29.
- Liturgy*, question respecting in the Queen's case, 30—courtly formality of, 31.
- Liverpool* (Lord), his speech, 23, 26.
- Locke*, his notions on the origin of civil government condemned by Mr. Pitt as dangerous, 467—his Essay, caution necessary in studying, 468.
- Loudon* (Lord), and 1500 men, defeated at Moy by the stratagem of a blacksmith, 121.
- Mahommed Ali*, anecdotes of, 231.
- Marino Faliero*, Doge of Venice, &c. 439—modelled upon French principles, 440—analysis of the plot, 443—defect in the subject, 443—the character of Angiolina, 447—the Prophecy of Dante, 451—the stanza in judiciously chosen, 451.
- Marshall* (Mr.), his scepticism, 149.
- Marshall* (Sir John), his *Chronicles* Canon, 395.
- Mathematical* studies, value of, 466.
- Mem'on* (Bust of), account of its embarkation at Thebes for Cairo, 240.
- Memoirs of the Rebellion in 1745-6*, 106—errors corrected by the Editor, 127.—from 1754 to 1758, by James Earl Waldegrave, 362—value of the work to the student of this period of our history, 380.—of the Right Hon. William Pitt, by Bishop Tomline, 452.
- Meteorology*, publications on, 337—the science still in its infancy, 337—its progress within late years, 337—accumulation of materials for the formation of a future theory, 338—definition, object and utility of the science, 339—the study recommended, 340—certainty of its principles, 341—its importance to agriculture, &c. 341—its future progress anticipated, 341—indebted to the labours of Humboldt and Leslie, 342—various instruments, 343—projection of cold, 345—want of some specific institution for the promotion of this science, 346—Mr Howard's work, 346—temperature, 347—alteration in the division of the seasons proposed, 348—temperature of London, 348—of large towns, 249—cycles of temperature, 350—mean temperature in the vicinity of London, 351—mean height of the barometer, 351—winds, 352—rain, 353—influence of winds on rain, 354—causes of rain, 354—influence of the moon on the weather, 356—of its declination on rain and tempera-

- tare, 358—Mr. Howard's theory of winds and weather, 359—merits of his work, 360—the climate of Penzance, 360.
- Zard*, succession of, 338.
- Mirage*, phenomenon of the, 260.
- Mission*, Unitarian, at Madras, 154.
- Mitchell* (Mr.) his translation of *Aristophanes*, reviewed, 50—has avoided gross passages, 52—offers an excuse for the obscenity of the original, 57—unfair towards Socrates, 68—extract from his Preliminary Discourse, 69—his inconsistencies, 76—exceptions against Euripides, 80—his translation on erroneous principles, 83—censured for introducing cents from Shakspeare, &c. 85—his general spirit, 86—omissions by, 86.
- Montesquieu*, maxim of, disputed, 8.
- Mummies* of animals, 247.
- Mystery* and absurdity, distinction between, 188.
- Newcastle*, Duke of, 365, 366—his promotion of Lord Butc, 374—his resignation, 376.
- Newton* (Sir I.) great confusion caused by him in the chronology of prophane history, 396.
- Nicopolis*, 301—ancient theatre at, 302.
- Nile*, extraordinary inundation of, 257.
- Nubia*, description of an excavated temple in, 257.
- Ombos*, beautiful ruins at, 239.
- Ossa and Olympus*, 298.
- Overton* (John), the Books of Genesis and Daniel defended against Count Volney, Dr. Francis, &c. 390.
- Outlaw of Faurus*, a poem, &c. 422—the tradition on which the subject is founded, 423—character of the hero, 420, 423—danger of fascinating delineations of immoral characters, 424—Leo described after the battle, 427—his penitence, 428—general character of the poem, 433.
- Parga*, 315—taken possession of by the British, 316—the cruelty of Ali Pasha towards the inhabitants, 317—who are compelled to abandon their country, 318.
- Party-Man*, 460.
- Penzance*, Forbes's observations on the climate of, 337—superior climate of, 361—skating unknown, and snow very rare at, 361.
- Phænomena*, *mirage*, 260—whirlwind, 260—locusts, 261.
- Photometer*, 343.
- Pitt* (W.) *Memoirs* of, 452—excellence of his private character, 454—anecdote of, 458—his sound religious principle, 459—his rivals, 461—particular disadvantages attending his entrance into public life, 462—his great ability, 462—early studies, 462—extraordinary facility in reading Greek, 466—desiderata in Mr. Gibbon's Life of, 467—letters from Lord Chatham to, 469—entrance into Parliament, 472—charge of inconsistency as to parliamentary reform, considered, 474—his sentiments on that reform as delivered in the House, 475—made Chancellor of the Exchequer, 480—the coalition of Fox and North, 481—refuses the situation of First Lord of the Treasury, 485—intention of, resuming the profession of the law, 486—placed at the head of the treasury, 488—his disinterestedness, 489—Governor Johnstone's eulogium upon his administration, 490—advises the King to propose an interview between himself and the Duke of Portland, 491—his Majesty's letter on the subject, 491—summing up of his political conduct, 493—extraordinary difficulties in which he was placed, 496—letters from the King to him, 497—his opinion as to the Regency Question, 498—his energy at the crisis of the French Revolution, 501.
- Poetry*, religious, remarks on, 328.
- Populace*, inflammatory appeals to the, 28.
- Prades* (Abbé de), his scandalous doctrines, 89.
- Pretender*, the, lands in Scotland, 108—escapes from Moy, 120—his want of firmness, 123—his ultimate success impossible, and why, 124.
- Psammethis*, (the Son of Pharaoh Necho,) his tomb, discovery and description of, 253—sculptures in, 261.
- Ptolemy*, Chronology of, 409.
- Publications*, noxious, cheapness of, 105.
- Pyramids*, Mr. Faber's remarks on that of Cephrenes, 230—hypothesis of a German professor respecting, 256—Mr. Faber supposes them to have been mystic tombs of Osiris, 257.
- Pyroscope*, 343.
- Quarterly Review*, 323.
- Queen*, conduct of, with regard to her replies, 27.

- Rain*, 353—influence of the winds on, 354—one universal cause of, 354—how far influenced by the moon, 358.
- Rebellion* in 1745-6, *Memoirs of*, 106—an important point of History, 108—arrival of the Pretender, 108—cause of the success of the rebels, 109—conduct of Sir John Cope vindicated, 110—battle of Preston Pans, 111—eclat of the first exploits of the Pretender, not extraordinary, 111—mode of fighting employed by the Highlanders, 114—advance of the rebels to Manchester and Derby, 115—their retreat, 116—pursued by the Duke of Cumberland, 117—the battle of Falkirk, 118—the rebel leaders uncertain whether the victory is on their side, 119—escape of the Pretender from Moy, 120—Lord George Murray defeats the royal troops at Athol, 121—battle of Culloden, 123—causes rendering the final success of the Pretender impossible, 124—dread entertained of the Highlanders by the English, 125—errors in the original, and corrected by the editor, 127.
- Reform in Parliament*, Mr. Pitt's declaration on the subject of, 474.
- Regency Question*, 497.
- Revelation*, its mysteries no argument against it, 150—ineffectual, unless the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures be admitted, 206.
- Robbers*, romantic ideas respecting poetical, 424.
- Scepticism*, embraced by those who hate Christianity for the restraints it imposes, 97.
- Schlegel*, (F.) his defence of Aristophanes, 66—animadversions on Euripides, 79.
- Seasons*, a new arrangement of the, 348.
- Selections from the Queen's Answers to the Addresses*, &c. 1.
- Shelley* (P. B.), his tragedy of the Cenci, 380—has added to the immortality of the story, 382—his raving and blasphemy, 385.
- Sheridan* (R. B.), 459—decidedly a party-man, 461.
- Smollett*, an instance of the erroneous colouring given to facts in his history, 379.
- Socrates* defended from the raillery of Aristophanes, 65—Mr. Mitchell's imputations against, 69—the same refuted, 72—his character appreciated, *Socratic argumentation*, 74—its defects, 75.
- Solicitor-General*, his speech, 20, 22.
- Southey* (Robert), *A Vision of Judgement*, 321—his contempt of authority, &c.,—his hexameters, 322—preface to the poem, 324—want of propriety in the selection of the metre, 325—his remarks on lascivious writers, 326—his loyalty, 328—estimated as an author, 329—plan of the poem, 330—his merits as a writer, 336—his Roderick, 337.
- Speeches of Messrs. Brougham, Denham, and Dr. Lushington*, 1—of his Majesty's Attorney and Solicitor-General, 1—of the Earl of Liverpool, 1.
- St. David's* (Bishop of), tracts by, 434—compares Deism and Unitarianism, 438.
- Standish* (F. H.), his *Life of Voltaire*, 88—defends suicide, 90—his profane encomium on the stage, 90—his book-making, 95—his abhorrence of priests, 97—his work, and the motives for publishing it, reprobated, 104.
- Stuart*, the inaccuracy of the admeasurements in his *Antiquities of Athens*, 288.
- Subotes*, their heroism at Klissura, 312—blockaded by Ali Pasha, 313—capitulate, and are treacherously butchered, 314—their final dispersion, 315.
- Talent*, disparity between parliamentary and legal, 473.
- Temperature*, comparative superiority of, in London, 348.
- Tempe*, vale of, described, 298.
- Temple* (Lord), 377.
- Theological criticism*, danger of, 212.
- Tomb of Psemmathis*, 253.
- Tomlin* (Bisshp), *Memoirs of the Right Hon. W. Pitt*, 452—the peculiar advantages possessed by him as a biographer of Mr. Pitt, 453—complaints against the work considered, 455—propriety of the plan adopted by him, 456—has introduced many interesting minor incidents, 457—his Remarks on the India Bill, 487—on the Regency, 497.
- Tracts on the Divinity of Christ, &c.*, by the Bishop of St. David's, 434—a valuable and seasonable publication, 434—1st Tract, Answer to the Letter of an Unitarian Lay-Seceder, 435—2d Tract, on the literal Evidence of our Lord's Divinity, 437—3d Tract, on the Repeal of the Statute against

- Blasphemy, 437—three Addresses to the Unitarians, 438.
- Translation*, peculiar difficulty of translating Aristophanes, 83—remarks on raphastic, condemned, 84—that of the Clouds by Cumberland, excellent, 85.
- Travels* to Sicily, Greece, and Albania, by the Rev. T. S. Hughes, 269.
- Travellers*, affected enthusiasm of, 269.
- Trinity*, the doctrine of, a mystery, 189—Bishop Horsley's statement of, 179.
- Turner's Tour* in the Levant, 273, 275.
- Unitarian Controversy*, publications on, 137.
- Unitarians*, essential difference between them and the Church of England, 138—their doctrines contradictory to Christianity, 139—their liberality spurious and arising from indifference, 141—at variance with each other, 142—their treatment of the Bible, 144—approach to Deism, 145—manner of interpreting the Scriptures, 146—oppose argument to Scripture evidence, 147—reject all supernatural doctrines, 151—credulous although sceptical, 152—detract in zeal, 154—in intellect, 156—attack less material points, 157—their petitiô principii, 158—conscious hollowness, 159—misrepresentations, 160—imbecile argument, 163—confound mystery with absurdity, 167—their platitudes, 168—inconsistencies, 172—quote authors who make against them, 175—differ from each other, 176—alternately courteous and abusive towards their opponents, 177—not very distinct from professed infidels, 185—Mr. Wardlaw's publication, 186—mystery, and absurdity distinguished, 188—alterations from the received Version disapproved of, 189—positiveness allowable in supporting Scripture, 193—Mr. Horne's work commended, 195—Mr. White and Bishop Horsley on the Trinity, 197—Christian doctrines ought to be fully stated, 199—mysteries intended to prove faith, 200—doctrine of the Athanasian Creed, 201—doctrine of a strict unity indispensable, 201—the claims of the Unitarians to that appellation disputed, 202—the doctrine of the incarnation, essential, 203—Unitarianism retrograde from the Christian dispensation, 205—plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, 206—danger of considering difficult passages of Scripture to be merely figurative, 208—the increase of Unitarianism little apprehended, 209—except from its flattering the corruption of human nature, 210—literary trifling with the Scriptures dangerous, 212—no settled point between complete belief and utter infidelity, 214—the religious and irreligious forming at the present day two distinct parties, 214—Unitarians endeavour to prove that our Lord's ministry was confined to one year, and why, 419—aim at the subversion of the Church, 437—Unitarianism not the Christianity of the New Testament, 438—comparison between it and Deism, 438.
- Vision of Judgement*, by R. Southey, Esq., 321—analysis of the subject, 330.
- Volney* (C. F.), *New Researches of Ancient History*, 389—asserts the genealogies in Genesis x. to be fabrications, 394—his extravagant conjectures, 396—his charge against Christian chronology, 404—his ignorance and falsehood, 405—assumes that the Pentateuch is a compilation, 417.
- Voltaire*, *Standish's Life* of, 88—how served by Frederic the Great, 92—imbibed his infidel principles from his godfather, the Abbé de Chateau Neuf, 96—his hypocrisy and dastardliness equal to his malignity, 98—great only in atrocity, 99—his ridiculous meanness, 100—rather a theist than an atheist, 101—his visit to the theatre at the performance of his *Irene*, 102—his death-bed, 103—his writings introduced into Spain, 104—cheap editions of his works, 101—not a republican, 105.
- Waldegrave* (Earl), *Memoirs*, 362—merit of the work, 362—paucity of similar works in the English language, 362—sketch of the author, 363—value of the information here given, 364—historical portraits, 365—character of the Duke of Newcastle, 366—of Lord Chatham, 367—of Mr. H. Fox, 368—of Lord Bute, 369—one object of the author to explain the changes of the ministry, 370—Sir Thomas Robinson, 371—difficult situation of the Duke of Newcastle, 371—Pitt becomes an adherent of the Princess

- of Wales, 372—coolness between the King and the Princess, in consequence of a match designed by the former for his grandson, 373—Fox named secretary of state, 373—conversation between Lord Waldegrave and the Prince of Wales, 374—the King's extreme dislike of Bute, 376—Duke of Newcastle resigns, 376—a new ministry, Chatham and Temple, 376—difficulties attending the arrangement of the new administration, 378—coalition of Newcastle and Chatham, 379.
- Waverley*, erroneous account of the battle of Preston-Pans in, 114.
- Warburton's* error, in following *Ælian*, and imputing the condemnation of Socrates to the influence of Aristophanes's satire, 78.
- Wardlaw* (Dr.), discourses on the principal points of the Socinian controversy, 137—Unitarianism Incapable of Vindication, 137—his canon for interpreting the Scriptures, 146.
- Wells* (Dr.), his discoveries on dew, 342.
- Whigs*, their conduct when in place in 1806, 43.
- Winds*, subterraneous ones, 298—winds, theory of, 352.
- Worsley* (Mr.), quotation of a deistical passage from, 145.
- Yates* (Mr.), his "A Vindication of Unitarianism," 137—his sentiments difficult to be ascertained, 141—character of his work, 143—his view of the doctrines of the Gospel, 148—substitutes definitions of his own, 162.

ERRATA IN No. XXXIII.

- 10, line 17, *for* but, *read* butt.
 13, line 42, *for* zealous, *read* jealous.
 75, line 15, *for* Mitford, *read* Mitchell.
 198, line 31, *for* satement, *read* statement

END OF VOL. XVII.

